0-315-01148-3

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

49006

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

- Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur
RUTH CAROLYN LAMBERT

Date of Birth — Date de naissance
MAY 10, 1949

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
CANADA

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe
P.O. BOX 2391, STATION M.
CALGARY, Alta
T2P 3C1

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse
A Comparison of the Value Systems of Male and Female ADMINISTRATORS and Female TEACHERS ON PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

University — Université
University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée
M. ED.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade
1980

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
DR. C. Bumbarger

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date
July 2, 1980

Signature
Ruth C. Lambert

NL-91 (4/77)

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NL-339 (Rev. 8/80)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A COMPARISON OF THE VALUE SYSTEMS OF MALE AND FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS AND FEMALE TEACHERS ON PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

by

© Ruth Carolyn LAMBERT

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL 1980

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Ruth Carolyn LAMBERT

TITLE OF THESIS A COMPARISON OF THE VALUE SYSTEMS OF MALE AND FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS AND FEMALE TEACHERS ON PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED MASTER OF EDUCATION

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED FALL 1980

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) Ruth C. Lambert

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

4 Admiral Street,
Charlottetown,
Prince Edward Island C1A 2C2

DATED June 17, 1980

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled A COMPARISON OF THE VALUE SYSTEMS OF MALE AND FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS AND FEMALE TEACHERS ON PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND submitted by Ruth Carolyn LAMBERT in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION.

Chester Bumbarger
Supervisor

Clive A.F. Padfield

J. Fris

Date June 17, 1980

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine and compare the similarities and/or differences in the value systems of three specific groups, Female Administrators, Male Administrators and Female Teachers on Prince Edward Island.

The study focussed on the following questions:

1. What are the similarities and/or differences in the value profiles of the groups in the study?
2. What are the similarities in the value hierarchies of the three groups in the study?
3. What are the differences in the "relative variability" of values of the groups in the study?

The sample was drawn from the total population of administrators and female teachers on Prince Edward Island. The instrument used, was an adapted version of Padfield's (1979) and Sjogren's (1969) instruments, with utilization of England's (1975) methodology. The analysis of data utilized a Fortran Computer programme designed by Mrs. C. Prokop, of the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta. Statistical procedures consisted of identifying the respondents' Primary Value Orientation. From this information a Value Profile was constructed for each individual, then Group Value Profiles compiled, and Behavioral Relevance Scores derived.

Value Hierarchies were constructed utilizing the Behavioral Relevance Scores, and Spearman Rank-Order

Correlation Coefficients were used to determine similarities in the value hierarchies of the three groups.

The homogeneity and heterogeneity of the responses to the concepts was investigated utilizing Average Deviation Scores and Analysis of Variance. Scheffe's tests were performed to determine if significant differences were present in the data.

Tentative conclusions were that there are both similarities and significant differences in the value systems of Male and Female Administrators and Female Teachers on Prince Edward Island and that personal value systems may indeed be considered as a variable for the women in this study who chose an administrative career in education. Whether value systems may be considered as a criterion for selecting females for administrative positions in education, is a problem left to further research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation and sincere thanks is expressed to my thesis supervisor, Dr. C. Bumbarger, for his kindness and unlimited consideration throughout the study. Many thanks are also extended to Dr. Clive Padfield, without whose guidance and encouragement, this study would not have been done. A sincere thank-you is also extended to Dr. J. Fris for taking the time to participate as a committee member.

Sincere thanks are extended to Mrs. C. Prokop for the many hours spent designing the computer programme for this study.

Appreciation is extended to the Superintendents on Prince Edward Island who gave their permission for the study and to Jim Blanchard and Jim MacKay of the P.E.I.T.F. for their interest and support in this project. To the administrators and teachers who participated in the study, a most sincere thank-you is extended.

To the many friends whose constant support was encouraging and especially to Cathy Campbell, whose patience was unlimited, my sincere and heartfelt gratitude.

Last, but not least, to my parents, without whose emotional and financial support, this endeavour would not have been possible, and to Rob Symonds, whose constant concern and encouragement helped to make it all easier, thank-you.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

I. THE STUDY 1
  A. Introduction 1
  B. The Statement of the Problem 2
    Subproblems 2
  C. The Significance of the Study 2
  D. Definition of Terms 3
  E. Assumptions, Limitations and Delimitations 6
    Assumptions 6
    Limitations 6
    Delimitations 7
  F. Summary 7
  G. Organization of the Thesis 8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 9
  A. Introduction 9
  B. Values 9
    The Concept of Value: A Definition 9
    Values and Culture 11
  C. Socialization 13
    The Impact of Values and Value Systems 13
    Values and Sex-Role Differentiation 14
    Masculinity - Femininity 16
    The Stereotypes 19
    Values of Men and Women 20

D. The Organization 22

Values and their Behavioral Significance 22

Value Systems and Value Hierarchies: Organizational Relevance 23

Group Values 24

Women in Educational Administration 25

E. Summary 27

III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE 28

A. The Questionnaire 28

Reliability 32

Validity 34

B. The Population 35

C. Collection of the Data 36

Distribution of the Questionnaire 37

D. The Returns 39

Non-Usable Returns 41

E. Statistical Procedure 43

F. Summary 49

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 50

A. Analysis of the Sample 50

B. Primary Orientation of the Groups 61

C. Group Value Profile 63

D. Personal Value Sytems of the Groups 65

Female Administrators 65

Male Administrators 69

Female Teachers 73

E. Comparison of the Value Profiles 77

By Group Value Type 77

By Operative Value Scores 85

F. Value Hierarchies 105

Female Administrators 105

Male Administrators 107

Female Teachers 108

G. Relative Variability of the Value Systems 112

H. Summary 117

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 119

A. Summary of the Investigation 119

B. Findings and Conclusions 120

Findings 120

Limitations of the Study 123

Conclusions 124

C. Implications 126

D. Recommendations for Further Research 128

References 130

APPENDIX A : England and Sjogren - Correspondence 136

APPENDIX B : Concept Evaluation 140

APPENDIX C : Instrument 147

APPENDIX D : Letters of Transmittal 159

APPENDIX E : Letter Included with Questionnaire 167

APPENDIX F : Follow-up Letter 169

APPENDIX G : Analysis of Concept Response 171

APPENDIX H : Average Deviation Scores 180

APPENDIX I : Analysis of Variance 185

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Concept Evaluation..................................33

2 Total Distribution of Questionnaires and Percentage Return by Regional Unit................40

3 Total Distribution and Percentage Return by Group.42

4 Within Group Comparison by Position- Male and Female Administrators..........................51

5 Between Group Comparison by Position- Male and Female Administrators..........................51

6 Percent Administrators and Teachers by Age........53

7 Percent Educational Background (Three Groups).....55

8 Percent Job Satisfaction by Group.................56

9 Percent Response to Question on Feelings About An In-School Administrative Position- By Group...58

10 Percent Time Spent in Actual Classroom Teaching (Administrators Only)..................60

11 Percent Primary Value Orientation of Male and Female Administrators and Female Teachers.....62

12 Between Group Comparison of Administrators by Concepts Classified Differently................78

13 Comparison of Administrators of Behaviorally Relevant Concepts Classified as "Mixed" with > 10 Difference in BRS and > 50 BRS...............79

14 Between Group Comparison of Female Administrators and Female Teachers by Concepts Classified Differently..................81

15 Comparison of Female Administrators and Female Teachers of Behaviorally Relevant Concepts Classified as "Mixed" with > 10 Difference in BRS and > 50 BRS..................82

16 Between Group Comparison of Male Administrators and Female Teachers by Concepts Classified Differently....................83

17 Comparison of Male Administrators and Female Teachers of Behaviorally Relevant Concepts Classified as "Mixed" with > 10 Difference in BRS and > 50 BRS...............................84

18 Comparison of Operative Value Scores - Ideas Associated with People............................87

19 Comparison of Operative Value Scores - Personal Goals of the Individual..................91

20 Comparison of Operative Value Scores - Groups of People.................................93

21 Comparison of Operative Value Scores - Goals of Educational Organizations......................94

22 Comparison of Operative Value Scores - Ideas about General Topics...............................96

23 Concepts Rated the Same by All Groups.............99

24 Concepts showing Significant Differences in Operative Value Scores : Male - Female Administrators.....................101

25 Concepts showing Significant Differences in Operative Value Scores : Female Teachers - Female Administrators..........102

26 Concepts showing Significant Differences in Operative Value Scores : Female Teachers - Male Administrators...........104

27 Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient......111

28 Comparison of Average Deviation Scores (AD Scores) of Three Groups.........................114

29 Analysis of Variance..............................116

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

1 Decision Rules for Calculating An Individual's Primary Value Orientation Classification....................................46

I. THE STUDY

A. Introduction

Since 1970, when the report by the Royal Commission on the Status of Women was published, more attention has been directed to the restriction of occupational opportunity for women in the Canadian labour force than ever before. While investigating areas including sex-role orientation, discrimination, career decision-making and career choice, researchers including Nixon (1973), Nixon and Gue (1975), Nixon and Hrynyk (1973), Robillard (1979) and Shack (1975) have all noted the lack of women in educational administration. Epstein (1971), Richardson-Walum (1977) and Stephenson (1973) have all expressed dissatisfaction and concern with what they consider to be occupational segregation by sex.

The under-representation of women in administrative positions in education, compared to their numbers in the teaching force, has been noted in studies by Asper (1974), McIntosh (1973) and Stokes (1974). However, according to Nixon and Hrynyk (1973) and Stokes (1974), there appears to be some reluctance on the part of women to apply for administrative positions. This study has attempted to supplement extant research by comparing the personal value systems of female administrators with male administrators, and female teachers on Prince Edward Island.

This province was chosen as it provided a small, manageable number in terms of a total population study. It also provided an environment with which the researcher was familiar. Therefore the focus of this study was directed toward the personal value systems of women who are in administrative positions in education on Prince Edward Island and the following research questions were derived.

B. The Statement of the Problem

The research objective was to examine and compare the similarities and/or differences in the personal value systems of three specific groups, namely female administrators, male administrators and female teachers. In order to do this, the following sub-problems were addressed:

Subproblems

1. What are the similarities and/or differences in the value profiles of the groups in the study?
2. What are the similarities in the value system hierarchies and the three groups in the study?
3. What are the differences in the "relative variability" of the values of the groups in the study?

C. The Significance of the Study

In philosophy, education, political science, economics and anthropology, as well as psychology and sociology, values have been the centre of theoretical attention.

Rokeach (1968) stated that "all these disciplines share a common concern with the antecedents and consequences of value organization and value change"(p.158).

Padfield (1979) utilized a revised version of England's (1975) Personal Values Questionnaire, to ascertain whether academic administrators and physical educators differed significantly in their personal value systems. One of his suggestions for further research was a comparison of the value systems of women and men.

Utilizing a combination of concepts taken from Padfield's (1979) instrument and Sjogren's (1969) instrument, this study sought to ascertain whether there are significant differences in the personal value systems of male and female administrators and female teachers on Prince Edward Island. Since a paucity of research appears to exist in the area of personal values and value systems, this investigation was designed to provide further input into the study of women in educational administration.

D. Definition of Terms

1. Values- "a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action" (Kluckhohn, 1951).
2. Personal Value System- A relatively permanent perceptual framework which shapes and influences the general nature of an individual's behavior. A personal value system may

be measured in part by the Personal Values Questionnaire (PVQ)(England, 1975).

3. Potential Values- All possible values held by an individual or specific group constituting the total value space. Potential values are comprised of two classes:
    a. Non-relevant or Weak Values:
    Values having little or no impact on behavior.
    b. Conceived Values:
    Values likely to be translated from the intentional state into behavior. Conceived values may be viewed in terms of:
        1) Operative Values:
        Those values most likely to have the greatest impact on behavior.
        2) Intended or Adopted Values:
        Those values which the individual professes to have, but which do not influence behavior (England, 1975).
4. Primary Value Orientation- An orientation as measured by responses to the PVQ as "high importance" and most consistently successful (pragmatic), right (moralistic) or pleasant (affective). If none of successful, right or pleasant is statistically most frequent, then the individual is classified as having a "mixed" primary value orientation (England, 1975).
5. Operative Values- Those concepts which are rated as

"high importance" on the PVQ and that fit the individual's primary value orientation (England, 1975).

6. Intended Values- Those concepts rated as "high importance" on the PVQ but which do not correspond with the individual's primary value orientation (England, 1975).
7. Adopted Values- Those concepts not rated as "high importance" on the PVQ but which correspond with the individual's primary value orientation (England, 1975).
8. Non-Relevant Values- Those concepts not rated as "high importance" on the PVQ and that do not correspond to an individual's primary value orientation (England 1975).
9. Relative Variability of a Value System- The homogeneity or heterogeneity of a value system (England, 1975)
10. Value System Hierarchy- A rank ordering of ideals or values in terms of importance (Rokeach, 1968).
11. Value Profile- The classification of values as operative, intended, adopted or weak. A value profile allows interpretation of responses to the concepts in the PVQ in value terms which have behavioral implications (Padfield, 1979).
12. Administrators- This title includes any principal, vice-principal, programme consultant or co-ordinator, qualifying for the position under Section 1:02 of the 1979 Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation Memorandum of Agreement.
13. Teacher- Any full-time instructional employee of a

Regional School Unit in the province of Prince Edward Island who meets the required certification to hold the position under the 1979 Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation Memorandum of Agreement.

E. Assumptions, Limitations and Delimitations

Assumptions

The major assumptions were:

1. that each subject answered the questionnaire honestly and to the best of his/her ability.
2. that the respondents understood the items within the usual limits of a survey questionnaire.

Limitations

The limitations of the study were inherent in the methods employed in gathering and analyzing the data and were further limited by the following:

1. Participation in the study was strictly voluntary as instructed by the Superintendents.
2. Due to voluntary participation, the results may not be representative of those people who chose not to participate.
3. The PVQ only measures a personal value system "in part" (England, 1975); no attempt was made in this study to account for any concepts not included in the questionnaire, or those areas outside the framework of an educational organization.

4. Results cannot be generalized to other provinces or countries.

Delimitations

The study was designed to investigate the Personal Value Systems of the three groups outlined, and was confined to:

1. the total population of principals, vice-principals, consultants and programme co-ordinators on Prince Edward Island.
2. the total population of women teachers on Prince Edward Island.
3. those concepts included in the questionnaire which were adapted from Padfield's (1979) and Sjogren's (1969) instruments.

F. Summary

This chapter has provided the rationale for an investigation of the personal value systems of male and female administrators and female teachers on Prince Edward Island. The significance of the study and research problems and sub-problems have been stated. A brief introduction to the theories which led to the conceptualization of the study has been made. The definition of terms used, and a listing of the assumptions, limitations and delimitations have been given.

G. Organization of the Thesis

Chapter I has discussed the background of the study and provided a statement of the problem. Chapter II gives an overview of the literature on values, socialization process and the organization which outlines the theoretical framework for the study. Chapter III is concerned with the research design, while Chapter IV relates to the analysis of data. A summary of major findings, general conclusions and implications of findings, together with suggestions for further research are found in Chapter V.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. Introduction

The following literature review builds a background for the theoretical framework of the study. Within a cultural context, it seeks to identify research pertinent to the socialization process and apply it to an overall value framework. To this end, the concepts value and value systems, their relationship to the socialization process and their importance in organizational behavior, will be explored.

B. Values

The Concept of Value: A Definition

Philosophers and social scientists have held varying views as to the meaning of "value". Attempts at precise definition have, as noted by Kluckhohn (1951), varied due to shifting connotation of the word "value" in everyday speech.

Kluckhohn's definition of value, according to Bryans (1971), takes the "culture, group and the individual's relation to culture and place in his group as a frame of reference" (p.8). Emphasizing the cognitive, affective and conative elements as vital to the concept, Kluckhohn (1951) in defining value stated:

> A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action. (p.395)

Rokeach (1968) asserted that "values have to do with modes of conduct and end states of existence" (p.159). Values are not seen as merely preferences. He stated:

> Once a value is internalized, it becomes consciously or unconsciously, a standard or criterion for guiding action, for developing or maintaining attitudes towards relevant objects and situations, for justifying one's own and other's actions and attitudes. (p.160)

Baier (1969) in differentiating values possessed by things and values held by people, noted that the former is an "evaluative property" ascertained in appraisal but the latter "are dispositions to behave in certain ways which can be ascertained by observation...tendencies of people to devote their resources (time, energy, money) to the attainment of certain ends" (p.40). Thornton (1967) in a discussion of Kluckhohn's definition of value stated that "values may be considered as influential normative standards of human action" (p.14).

Although most choices will likely conform to social norms, Thornton (1967) asserted that Kluckhohn's definition allows:

> for the operation within an individual of standards which may influence him toward action which does not conform with that prescribed by the social norms of groups with which he is associated. (p.14)

According to Williams (1959) "a group goal is not necessarily identical or even congruent with the values, motives or goals of individual members considered distributively" (p.382).

Although no more observable than is "culture", value is a property or criterion by which goals are chosen. In the operative sense, in terms of the selections or choices individuals make, Lupini (1965) has stated that "values are not the concrete goals of action but rather the _criteria_ by which goals are chosen; hence they influence selection" (p.52).

Most important to the concept, no matter how values are defined, according to Padfield (1979) "there appears to be a clear action component built into the concept" (p.14). It is this "action" component that researchers in the social sciences use in order to clarify issues pertinent to the individual, his relationship to his group, and the behavioral relevance within a given culture.

Values and Culture

In order to better understand the complexity of values and value orientations within the individual and/or group, the origin of values should be considered. Kluckhohn (1951) stated that "values are clearly, for the most part, cultural products" (p.398).

Both Mead (1935) and Benedict (1934), in their studies of primitive societies, have noted that human nature is primarily affected by cultural molding during early infancy. Neither of these researchers claimed that personality is fashioned completely by culture; however, they noted that a culture emphasizes and selects certain traits as desirable or undesirable. Sargent and Williamson (1966) asserted that social usage can also define norms for the behavior and personality of some segments of the population, such as for men and women.

Sargent and Williamson (1966) noted that although psychologists have criticized the work of both Mead and Benedict, anthropologists have agreed with their theories in order to obtain a more complete picture of the personality in each culture. In support of theories such as those expounded by Mead and Benedict, Padfield (1979) stated that "specific values are learned and acquired through multiple life experiences in a specific culture or cultures" (p.14). According to Parsons, Shils, Allport and Olds (1951) "patterns of value orientation have been singled out as the most crucial cultural elements in the organization of systems of action" (p.159) and in further discussion Parsons, Shils, Allport, Kluckhohn, Murray, Sears, Sheldon, Stouffer and Tolman (1951) stated:

> With the institutionalization of culture patterns, especially value-orientation patterns, the threefold reciprocal integration of personality, social system and culture come full circle. (p.26)

These value patterns, which are institutionalized in the social structure, include the operation of role mechanisms and organize the behavior of adults in society. With an individual, expectations which become role-expectations, are developed. It is through the process of socialization, Parsons, Shils, Allport and Olds (1951) have asserted, that adults act to maintain and modify the social system and value patterns in which and by which they live.

C. Socialization

The Impact of Values and Value Systems

According to Richardson-Walum (1977) and Deaux (1976), as stated by Robillard (1979), "socialization is the process by which individuals learn the values of the culture in which they live, so that they consider these values to be a natural part of themselves" (p.11). Parsons, Shils, Allport, Kluckhohn et al. (1951), in support of this statement, acknowledged that "there is approximate agreement that the development of identification with adult objects is an essential mechanism of the socialization process" (p.17). Furthermore, they stated that the most significant characteristic of identification is that in relevant contexts, the child comes to accept the adult's values. Value-orientations which are comprised of cultural traditions, are therefore transmitted to the next generation and "the child becomes oriented to the wishes which embody for him the values of the adult" (p.18). Bandura and Walters (1963), Sears (1965) and Skolnick (1973) supported this statement by asserting that children learn to conform to parental and cultural expectations. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) noted that it is through the process of socialization and as a consequence of identification with parents that children spontaneously accept their parents' values.

Epstein (1971) has noted that early socialization is

important in the establishment of personal identity. When, as a child, concepts of value are defined as applying differentially to men and women, there exists a failure in the value system to provide cultural support later in life for adult women wishing to become professionals.
Epstein (1971) stated:

> Social definitions are intrinsic to the individual's self-concepts, and help to shape hierarchies of choice, definitions of choice, definitions of rewards, and pressures creating guilts...That many occupations are considered "male" and others "female" has considerable effect on the early socialization process of the individual and on recruitment and performance later in life. (p.46)

Toews (1973), in studying self-hatred in women, has noted that "research on the antecedents and impact of cultural devaluation of women is lacking" (p.18).

Values and Sex-Role Differentiation

According to Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) and Richardson-Walum (1977) researchers today reject the notion that sexuality is biologically programmed. A basic proposition for those researchers ascribing to the social learning model is that sex-typed behavior is learned through rewards, punishments and imitation of adult models. Cognitive developmentalists, according to Richardson-Walum (1977), posit that "a child's sexual ideas and sex role concepts result from the child's structuring his own experience" (p.37). Although an area of some controversy in psychology, the importance of these models cannot be underestimated since they provide insight into the fact that males and females are no longer being viewed as inherently biologically different in the area of sex-roles especially pertaining to career choice. If biological differences are no longer viewed as the major influence in sex-role differentation then other areas should be investigated.

Richardson-Walum (1977) asserted that "sex" simply refers to the biological aspect within the individual's physiological structure and is an "ascribed" status at birth. A person with a given anatomy is sex-typed male or female. She utilizes the term "gender" in reference to those psychological, social and cultural components of behavior and attributes which one learns according to whether the person is male or female. Richardson-Walum stated:

> Gender identity- what it means to be male or female in terms of appropriate role performance, personality structure, attitudes and behavior-is not determined at birth...a child with a given anatomical structure...is taught to think, feel and act in ways considered natural, morally appropriate or desired for a person of that sex. (p.6)

As a result of culturally constructed sex-stereotyping, Epstein (1971) and Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) asserted that acceptable occupational and social patterns of self-expectation and self-image are thus derived through socialization which also encompasses the values within our society. In an effort to relate values and gender Richardson-Walum (1977) stated that "ideas about gender do not occur in a vacuum, they are intricately linked with the culture's core 'values' " (p.10). It is on this basis that individuals within a given culture learn what is appropriate in role-expectations, appropriate in role-performance and appropriately "masculine" and "feminine", in terms of behavior, within the limitations of their given anatomical structure.

Masculinity - Femininity

Researchers such as Klein (1950) have argued against the validity of masculinity-feminity tests on the grounds that the concepts of masculine and feminine behavior are tied closely to sex stereotypes in our society. Williams (1959) and Lewis (1968) have both agreed to the emotional and value loading of the words "masculine" and "feminine". Even so, according to Lewis (1968) "evidence that M-F scales differentiate men from women equally well in a variety of cultures suggests that a rather basic distinction is being measured, although this does not necessarily invalidate the cultural stereotype argument" (p.70). Lewis noted that the words "masculine" and "feminine" carry certain "tone" qualities and that they do not necessarily mean of male or female sex. She stated that:

> the dichotomous nature of the term "masculinity-femininity" serves to perpetuate a stereotype concerning the difference between men and women which has long since been proven psychologically unsound. (p.91)

Usage of these terms has persisted among clinicians such as Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rozenkrantz and Vogel (1970). By dichotomizing what are considered acceptable behavior traits which they ascribe differentially to men and women, they seem to assert that in this culture, for a woman to be considered mature and healthy as an adult, she must behave in ways which are considered immature and socially undesirable, otherwise she risks having her femininity called into question. To illustrate this point, in a study by Bem (1974), some of the characteristics attributed to males by college students are that males are seen as assertive, athletic, individualistic and self-reliant. Females are seen as affectionate, compassionate, loyal and understanding. While these are only a few traits attributed to each sex, and although none are strongly negative or pejorative, it serves as an example, according to Williams (1977) that "the prevailing values of American society are such that as abstractions the masculine traits are likely to be seen as more valuable because they serve the goals of society"(p.341).

By using "masculine and "feminine" in order to describe personality aspects of the individual, Williams (1977) has stated that:

> such usage is not only sexist reinforcing the relationship between socially valued characteristics and males, it also encourages the notion that if girls are going to fulfill their potential, they must become more masculine. (p.179)

The notion of dichotomizing personality traits and characteristics by sex, according to Williams (1977), places a woman in a precarious double-bind. A woman exhibiting characteristics sex-typed as purely "feminine" embodies a collection of traits which are negatively valued in traditionally male-oriented occupations and professions. In exhibiting "masculine" traits, she violates the culturally imposed behavioral norms of her sex. Until such time as the current differential designation of behaviors and personality characteristics which require that women do not exhibit masculine-typed characteristics and men do not exhibit feminine-typed characteristics is eliminated, many women who move into higher level professional and administrative positions may find themselves in anxiety-provoking situations. To illustrate this point, Wolman and Frank (1972) studied groups where a lone woman participated in a professional, task-oriented peer group and found the following anxiety-provoking effects of being the only female in the group.

> If she acted friendly, she was thought to be flirting. If she apologized for alienating the group she was seen as a submissive woman taking her place...If she asked for help, she earned a "needy" female label. If she became angry... she was seen as competitive in a bitchy, unfeminine way. (p.8) (cited in Williams, 1977)

Thus it appears that cultural norm-induced, psychological problems may be created by the differential designation of behavior and personality characteristics ascribed to men and women.

In order to alleviate this problem, Bem (1974) and Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974) in introducing the concept of androgyny as a replacement for sex-linked evaluation of personality, have argued that all individuals integrate personality traits that have been called masculine and feminine. Healthy, socially desirable traits, which instead of characterizing one sex would characterize the healthy human regardless of sex identity, are essential to help eliminate the culturally constructed conflict situation for women which researchers such as Nixon (1973), Robillard (1979), Shack (1975), Stokes (1974), and Toews (1973) view as leading to confusion of sex-roles with occupation roles.

The Stereotypes

Having defined a sex-role stereotype as a consensual array of beliefs about the differing characteristics of men and women, Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman and Broverman (1968) concluded from their study that "women also hold negative values of their worth relative to men" and that "despite professed equality of the sexes, masculine characteristics are seen as more socially desirable by both men and women" (p.293).

Lunneborg (1970), in comparing stereotypic sex-role descriptions with actual sex differences, was able to confirm the hypothesis that perceived or predicted sex differences are even greater than actual sex differences, exaggerating existing differences and creating others. Lambert (1971) demonstrated that differentiated sex-role stereotypes exist even in children.

In the perceptions of role, Lewis (1968) stated "to the extent that personal values are involved, girls tend to stress personal comfort and social service motivation... and they are less concerned about power and esteem than are boys" (pp.35-36).

According to Robillard (1979), in a culture where basic beliefs and values exist, which differentiate the role of women and men in society, "women are likely to be culturally assigned work functions which reflect an extension of their sex role" (p.14).

Values of Men and Women

Allport and Vernon as early as 1931, developed a scale to measure the strength of certain values in the individual's personality. Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey (1951), Fisher (1948) and Traxler and Vecchione (1959) using this scale, consistently found varying degrees of sex differences in all values relating to the theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious values of males and females. Despite the fact that these differences are significant, they are not numerically large and there is considerable overlap between the sexes on each scale. Studies by Cartwright (1972), Taylor and Barron (1963), and Walberg (1969) have revealed significant sex differences in distinguishing values and interests of women in fields that have been traditionally male-dominated such as the sciences (specifically physics) and medicine. Bernard (1964) found significant differences in values relating to male and female professors in university settings.

According to Williams (1977) "the values and interests of females collectively are different in important, measurable ways from those of males in this society" (p.190) and as Williams (1977) asserted, these differences seem to point to "the different sets of experiences of the two sexes as they are socialized to be members of society" (p.194). She noted that cultural pressures have traditionally prepared girls for a lifetime of domesticity as opposed to a lifetime of employment in the work world.

The Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada (1970) has acknowledged that within the labour force women have held positions traditionally considered to be "female" and that this restriction has limited the occupational alternatives open to women. Nixon (1973) stated that although the number of women in the labour force has increased, this situation "has not resulted in an ideological acceptance of their role in the world of work" (p.7). Women facing decisions about careers traditionally viewed as "male", and having been socialized by certain role expectations, role performance and appropriate "feminine" behavior, have had to overcome barriers constructed by culture and tradition in order to fulfill their potential in the world of work.

However, some women in spite of the above, do hold positions in fields traditionally considered to be male-oriented. Little research has been conducted to ascertain whether their values differ significantly with those women who choose more traditional, female-oriented careers.

D. The Organization

Values and their Behavioral Significance

In the conceptualization of the role of values in behavior Scheibe (1970) stated that:

> What a person does (his behavior) depends on what he wants (his values) and what he considers to be true or likely (his beliefs) about himself and the world (his psychological ecology). (p.1)

Baier (1969) stated that "the values people have are important determinants of their behavior" (p.33). Rokeach (1968) developed the concepts of centrality and peripherality in order to assess a person's beliefs and values. He asserted that the more central a value or belief, the more stable it is, and the wider its domain. Thus when a person hierarchically orders or rank orders his values in terms of importance, the individual denotes the importance of the values within the personal value system. The more central a value the greater the possibility of the value having behavioral implications for action. The more peripheral, the less chance of the value overtly influencing behavior.

In an extension of Rokeach's (1968) concept, England (1975) theorized that all values may be seen as potential values and that they may be classified in two ways. "Non-relevant" or "weak" values have little or no impact in a behavorial sense. However, "conceived" values which he classifies as " operative", "intended", or "adopted" values have a relatively high probability of being translated into actual behavior. It is from these values that researchers derive the action component essential to the study of values. It is within this framework that it becomes possible to study the individual or the group within a given organization.

Value Systems and Value Hierarchies: Organizational Relevance

The importance of studying the value systems of male and female administrators within an organizational context cannot be dismissed lightly simply because the literature illustrates that males and females differ significantly in their value-orientation patterns as shown in studies by Allport, Vernon and Lindzey (1951), Fisher (1948) and Traxler and Vecchione (1959). England (1975) asserted that the personal value system has a direct influence on the individual's behavior in his or her organizational role. Conversely, according to Jacob and Flink (1962), the individual's role within the organization may also influence his or her value system. Both of these propositions are most important to the study of values within the organization. Although contrary to one another, both statements suggest that research is needed in order to understand more fully the importance of personal value systems of individuals or groups in the organization and the context in which the individual, or group, functions.

Available research on values, (England,1975; Lupini,1965; Padfield,1979; Thornton,1967; von Fange,1961) points to the fact that values and value systems play an important role in the area of leadership behavior, decision making and value conflict within the organization. Knowledge and awareness of these areas of potential conflict are most important to the smooth functioning of the organization.

Group Values

Tosi and Carroll (1976) have noted that group values are similar to individual values and "that groups within organizations tend to have a uniformity of beliefs and values to a greater or lesser degree" (p.104). Padfield (1979) stated that "individuals with different personal and organizational responsibilities apparently differ in value patterns to a significant degree" (p.29). In an investigation of the scores of homo- and heterogeneity of the scores of the value concepts of physical educators and academic administrators, Padfield was forced to suspend judgement on his hypothesis that there is a significant difference on scores of homo- and heterogeneity within groups in his study. Although F-tests resulted in some concepts showing significant differences, overall, clear pattern emerged. If values within the organization are becoming more heterogeneous, as Flowers, Hughes, Meyers and Meyers (1975) and Bennis (1976) state, Padfield's research could not confirm this. However, the importance of these works is to assert that the more homogeneous the value systems of the groups within the organization, the less likely the conflict potential would be amongst the group members.

Abbott's (1960) study illustrated that conflict may arise because of differing value systems of the organization's group members. Campbell, Bridges and Nystrand (1977), in a discussion of the results of Abbott's (1960) study reported that "the findings of this investigation suggest that harmonious interpersonal relationships can be maintained despite differences in basic value positions, provided the differences are assessed accurately" (p.202). However, a paucity of research exists in the area of both between-group and within-group differences, specifically, with respect to the value systems of male and female administrators and the impact that their personal value systems might have in terms of their behavior within the organization.

Women in Educational Administration

Crosby (1973), in a discussion of her own study and as a recommendation for further research, stated that the study of values is an area where researchers "might use these data and the structure of established theory as a starting point to explain and understand the place of women in educational administration." Padfield (1979) has also called for further study in the area of personal values and value systems of men and women in education. There appears to be a lack of information pertaining to values and the woman's role in the organization. However, a number of studies in other areas exist which provide insight into self-perception and the role of women in administration.

For example, Barter (1959) examined reasons for the decline in the number of women in administrative positions from 1925-1950 and found that "the apathetic attitude of women teachers toward administrative positions emerged as a key factor in their present status" (p.73). Crosby (1973) noted that "women do not view themselves as being discriminated against", while contrary to these findings, Dale (1973) in a similar study noted that "the pattern that emerges is that women who strive to achieve, are systematically discouraged from reaching their highest human potential" (p.127). Whether or not women are discriminated against in the field of educational administration, studies by Crosby (1973), Nixon (1973), Nixon and Gue (1975), Nixon and Hrynyk (1973), Robillard (1979) and Shack (1975) all note the scarcity of women in administrative positions and have sought ways to clarify this issue.

E. Summary

The review of the literature has built a background for the theoretical framework upon which the study is based. The concepts of value, values and culture and the impact of socialization on values and value systems were presented. A paucity of research relating to men and women, and the values they hold within an organizational context, has been noted. Attention has been paid to the importance of studying value systems in order to further the understanding of group behavior within the organization. Lastly, the scarcity of women in administrative positions has been documented and the theoritical link between this phenomenon and sex-differences in value orientations has been outlined.

III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

The purpose of this chapter is to describe: (1) the questionnaire, (2) the population, (3) the collection of data, (4) the returns and (5) the statistical procedures that were used for this study.

A. The Questionnaire

According to Padfield (1979), the Personal Values Questionnaire (PVQ) includes:

> concepts which relate to organizational goals, personal goals, groups of people, ideas associated with people and general topics. Each subject is asked to evaluate each of the concepts on two dimensions: importance (high, average or low) and meaning (successful, right or pleasant). (p.54)

A modified version of England's questionnaire has been used by Padfield (1979) with academic administrators and physical educators. Sjogren (1969) utilized his modified version with educational administrators.

England (1975), in adapting the methodology of Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957), described the development of the Personal Values Questionnaire as follows:

> In order to specify a set of concepts relevant to the personal value systems of managers a pool of 200 concepts was selected from the literature dealing with organizations and with individual and group behavior. In addition, ideological and philosophical concepts were included to represent major belief systems. A panel of judges reduced this pool. (p.3)

England (1975) utilized five categories with which to present the concepts, and for the purpose of this study they were modified to: Ideas Associated With People, Personal Goals of the Individual, Groups of People, Goals of Educational Organizations and Ideas About General Topics. By using four scales to represent two modes of valuation, he first evaluated concepts on a high, average, low importance scale. England (1975) noted that why a person thinks certain concepts are important, gives a "reasonable basis for determining the behavioral significance of different classes of values" (p.3).

In the secondary modesright, successful and pleasant- he evaluated the subjects' mode of valuation as either moralistic, pragmatic or affective. Of the pragmatic mode, he stated:

> It suggests that an individual has an evaluative framework that is primarily guided by success-failure considerations; will a certain course of action work or not; how successful or unsuccessful is it apt to be. (p.3)

The ethical-moral mode of valuation suggests:

> An evaluative framework consists of ethical considerations influencing behavior toward actions and decisions which are judged to be 'right' and away from those judged to be 'wrong'. (p.3)

Of the affective, or "feeling" mode of valuation, he suggests:

> An evaluative framework which is guided by hedonism where one behaves in ways that increase pleasure and decrease pain. (p.3)

As the PVQ in this study was to be used with both teachers and administrators, it was necessary to modify the instrument to suit a population of school and school-related personnel. Permission was obtained from Dr. England, Dr.

Padfield and Dr. Sjogren to make the necessary modifications in adapting their survey instruments to better suit a population of administrators and teachers on Prince Edward Island. (see Appendix A for correspondence)

A list of 82 concepts was compiled from both Padfield's (1979) and Sjogren's (1969) studies. Prior to compiling the list, it was decided to delete any concept that was only pertinent to a university setting and to modify any concept that was overtly Americanized. The following concepts from Padfield's (1979) study were deleted: Research, Government Support, Financial Support, Financial Stability, Academic Freedom, National Recognition and Senior Administrators. Any concept referring to State or United States from Sjogren's (1969) study was modified. An example is that State Department of Education was modified to Department of Education.

A total of ten persons, five male graduate students in the Department of Educational Administration and five females from the Edmonton Public School System with both teaching and administrative experience, were asked to evaluate the concepts with regard to suitability for inclusion in the questionnaire. Each "judge" was individually contacted and appointments made to explain the purpose of the study. As the concepts had already been used and evaluated for use in two previous studies, it was felt that a three-category method for inclusion would suffice. The categories for evaluation were set as definitely include, probably include and do not include. The judges were requested to identify any concept which, in their opinions, should be included in the proposed study and to suggest substitutes for those concepts they deemed unsuitable for inclusion.

Prior to tabulating the evaluated concepts, decision rules for inclusion were defined as follows:

1. if the total of the ratings "definitely include" and "probably include" equalled 90 to 100 percent, or
2. if "definitely include" equalled 80 percent, then the concept was included.

Of 82 concepts, 22 were eliminated, leaving a total of 60. An additional 4 concepts were suggested as replacement. To further examine the concepts, five of the original ten judges were asked to evaluate the remaining 64 concepts for clarity and understanding of definition. Two women and three men agreed to this request. Time was a factor in choosing only two women. The decision rule was set at 80 percent for inclusion, which resulted in the elimination of 3 concepts, leaving a total of 61.

The concepts aggressiveness, conformity, ability, power, income, prestige, influence and conflict were excluded by the judges in the first round. However, it was decided to include these concepts in the final instrument. Padfield's (1979) precedent for including concepts not chosen by the judges, and the writings of Hoy and Miskel (1978) noting the importance of these concepts in the functioning of the organization, provided the basis for this decision. (see Appendix B for Concept Evaluation)

The combination of concepts from Padfield's (1979) instrument and Sjogren's (1969) instrument originally comprised a total of 82 items. The final total of concepts used, equalled 69. (see Table 1)

The instrument used, (see Appendix C) was printed on yellow paper. Padfield's (1979) research indicated that studies by Robinson and Agism (1951) and Nixon (1954) revealed that questionnaires printed on yellow paper yielded a higher percentage return.

Reliability

The Lusk and Oliver (1972) study replicated a 1966 study by England of a national sample of United States managers, and found that "the difference between the 1966 sample and the 1972 to be very small, .033 for 66 concepts and four concepts had a difference of .10 or greater." England (1975) claims that "the PVQ methodology provides valid and meaningful information about values" (p.122).

Padfield (1979) conducted a test-retest design as "an estimation of the modified instrument's reliability" and found that "the primary values of 20 of the 24 subjects, or 83.3 percent, remained constant on the test-retest" (p.60). Using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation, the coefficient of stability r =.70 was obtained. Larger than r =.50, .70 was satisfactory when combined with the 83.3

TABLE 1

CONCEPT EVALUATION

Category	Total Number 1st Judging	Eliminated	Concepts Retained	Concepts Added	Total Concepts Remaining	Eliminated After 2nd Judging	Reintroduced	Total
Ideas Associated With People	23	8	15	0	15	0	3	18
Personal Goals of Individuals	18	7	11	+1	12	0	4	16
Groups of People	11	0	11	+2	13	1	0	12
Goals of Educational Organizations	13	4	9	+1	10	0	0	10
Ideas About General Topics	17	3	14	0	14	2	1	13
Totals	82	22	60	+4	64	3	8	69

percent consistency of the primary value orientations. (Padfield, 1979)

Time did not allow for a test-retest because it was necessary to await permission to use Sjogren's (1969) concepts. As concepts in this instrument were included in either Padfield's (1979) or Sjogren's (1969) instruments, or both, it was decided to accept the Lusk and Oliver (1972), Padfield (1979) and Sjogren (1969) studies as indicators of the PVQ's reliability.

Validity

Kerlinger (1973) has stated that the most common definition of validity is epitomized by the question, "Are we measuring what we set out to measure?" (p.457). This definition refers to whether a research instrument is, in fact, measuring the conceptual intent of the study. Nixon (1973) states that "in this definition the emphasis is on the intention of the researcher" (p.55).

The process of evaluating and modifying the instrument to suit the population in the study was described in the previous section. As extreme care was taken to provide independent input by utilizing "judges" as experts in the evaluation of concepts used, and as the primary purpose for using this questionnaire centred on an investigation of the personal value systems of the three groups outlined previously, it was felt that the criteria for providing evidence of content validity were met. As Borg and Gall

(1971) stated, "content validity is the degree to which the sample of test items represents the content that the test is designed to measure" (p.136). In defining face validity as "the evaluator's appraisal of what the content of the test measures", it was felt that these criteria were also met. (Borg and Gall, 1971, p.136) As only the "wording" of the concepts, not the "intent" or "meaning" was changed to suit a school population, and as all concepts used were also used by Padfield (1979) and Sjogren (1969), or both, it was judged that overall the criteria for content validity were met.

B. The Population

Initially the study was to include the total population of in-school administrators and a random sample of women teachers in full-time employment on Prince Edward Island. The random sample of women teachers was changed to the total population when it was discovered that there are only 25 women who are in-school administrators on Prince Edward Island. It was hoped that the demographic information might identify women teachers who had been administrators and were no longer in these positions for various reasons. Programme consultants and coordinators were also added to the population as the definition of administrator given in Section 1:02 of the 1979 Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation Memorandum of Agreement states:

> "Administrative Positions" shall mean the position of Program Consultant, Program Coordinator, Principal, Vice-Principal and Department Head. (p.1)

Therefore, the study included a sample of voluntary participants drawn from the total population of full-time, in-school female and male administrators and female teachers, as well as female and male consultants and coordinators employed in Regional Board Offices on Prince Edward Island. Department heads were not included as identification of these individuals would have been extremely difficult, necessitating a survey of the total population of men teachers as well. It was felt that the added time and expense needed to identify these individuals was not available.

C. Collection of the Data

In late Fall 1979, Mr. James Blanchard, General Secretary of the Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation (hereafter to be cited as the P.E.I.T.F.) was contacted by telephone to discuss procedural matters pertaining to receiving permission to conduct a survey questionnaire on Prince Edward Island. The researcher was advised to contact the five Regional Superintendents. At this time, Mr. Blanchard agreed that the P.E.I.T.F. would supply the lists of teaching, administrative and Board Office personnel once permission was obtained from the Superintendents.

A letter explaining the purpose of the proposed study was sent to each Superintendent in October. All responses were received by mid-December and all granted the permission sought. (see Appendix D) As one of the Superintendents insisted that participation in the study be voluntary, the researcher stressed the voluntary nature of the study when contacting the principals with regards to their schools' participation in the study.

Distribution of the Questionnaire

The research was carried out on Prince Edward Island during the latter part of January and the month of February, 1980.

The researcher contacted the Superintendents by telephone to re-confirm permission to enter the schools. Three of five of the Superintendents requested interviews to further explain the purpose of the study. Two Superintendents requested that the researcher meet with their principals at a Board Office Principals' meeting. Appointment dates were set at this time.

The P.E.I.T.F. was contacted and a list of teachers, administrators, consultants and coordinators was obtained. A packet was prepared for each school, containing individually addressed envelopes to each woman teacher and the administrators in the school. Included in each personally addressed envelope was a letter explaining the purpose of the study. The letter contained information about completing the questionnaire which Padfield (1979) suggested in order to help clarify the three categories. It also stressed the anonymity of responses and cited explanations about the coding on the questionnaire. As printing and distribution was extremely expensive, reference was made to that fact. An adhesive return label was included so that the distribution envelope could be used for returning the questionnaire. The letter requested that the teacher return the questionnaire to the principal within three days.

Consultants and coordinators employed in Regional Board Offices, received self-addressed, stamped envelopes so the questionnaire could be returned by mail. The letter they received had the words "to your Principal" deleted.(see Appendix E)

The researcher personally visited a total of 57 schools on Prince Edward Island. At 52 schools she spoke with the principal. At two schools she spoke with the vice-principal and in three schools she spoke with the secretary. In schools where the principal or vice-principal was not available, follow-up calls were made by telephone to ensure that personal contact was made. Instructions for distribution of questionnaires were written on packets at schools where an administrator was not present for an interview.

The remaining ten principals were contacted at two Board Office Principals' meetings. Explanations remained standard at this time. Arrangements for collection of questionnaires were made at the time of delivery.

D. The Returns

As previously indicated, arrangements for collection of completed questionnaires were made at the time of delivery. Schools in three of the five Regional Units returned the questionnaires to their Board Offices to be picked up by the researcher at a later date. Every school in one Unit bulk-mailed the questionnaires to Alberta. The researcher revisited each school in the one remaining Unit and personally collected the packets on a pre-arranged date. All schools were informed that late returns should be forwarded to the P.E.I.T.F. which would send them to Alberta after a certain date. The principals were also informed that blank questionnaires were available through the P.E.I.T.F. should any teacher misplace the questionnaire and subsequently wish to complete one.

Only one school on Prince Edward Island chose not to participate in the study. These teachers and administrators were eliminated from the sample. Of 907 questionnaires distributed to 67 schools and five Regional Board Offices, 668 were returned, for a total of 73.6 percent. Of the 668 returns, 590 questionnaires proved usable on the initial sight check and were sent for computer key-punching. (see Table 2 for Unit breakdown of returns).

England (1975) and Padfield (1979) considered questionnaires to be usable if 95 percent of the items were complete. This decision rule was adopted for the purpose of this study. Any questionnaire having more than four of 69

TABLE 2

TOTAL DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRES AND PERCENTAGE RETURN BY REGIONAL UNIT

	Number of Schools Participating	Number Distributed	Number Returned	% Returned
Unit 1	9/9	143	122	85.3
Unit 2	15/15	206	157	76.2
Unit 3	22/23	330	221	66.9
Unit 4	19/19	182	135	74.2
Unit 5	2/2	27	18	66.6
Board Office Consultants/ Co-ordinators (Total)		19	15	78.9
Total	67/68	907	668	73.6

items not completed, was discarded as a non-usable return. Mrs. C. Prokop of the Department of Educational Administration, included this rule in the Fortran computer program designed to analyze the data for the study. A further thirteen questionnaires, or cases, were rejected, leaving a total of 577 or 63.6 percent overall usable returns. (see Table 3 for group breakdown)

Non-Usable Returns

Of 78 original non-usable returns, 20 questionnaires were selected for overall comprehension of concept and displayed willingness to participate in the study. These questionnaires were returned to the respondent as most of them had only one page incomplete indicating that for some reason, the respondent had omitted to complete the questionnare either through carelessness, or because pages had stuck together. Rather than discard the questionnaires, they were returned with a letter attached requesting completion and explaining the rationale for their being sent back. The respondent was requested to either complete the questionnaire or return it stating why it was incomplete. (See Appendix F) A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided. Although not a traditional approach in research, it was felt that rather than ask the respondent to complete an entire questionnaire again, the time to be saved would encourage compliance with the request.

Of the remaining 58 non-usable returns, six had been

TABLE 3

TOTAL DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE RETURN BY GROUP

Group	No. Expected Return	No. Total Usable	No. Non-Usable	% Return Non-Usable	% Overall Returned and Usable
Female Administrators	25	22	0	0	88.0
Male Administrators	105	79	3	3.5	75.2
Female Consultants/ Co-ordinators	6	4	1	20.0	66.6
Male Consultants/ Co-ordinators	13	11	0	0	84.6
Teachers	758	461	74	13.8	61.4
Unidentified Questionnaires			13 *		
Totals	907	577	91	13.6	63.6

* This figure was calculated _after_ keypunching.

sent to persons on extended sick leave, three to persons on leave of absence, one to a male teacher and one to a teacher's aide mistakenly identified as a teacher. Of 47 remaining questionnaires, 28 were completely blank seemingly indicating a lack of willingness to participate in the study. Of the remaining 19 questionnaires, 12 respondents indicated difficulty in understanding the terms right, pleasant and successful within the context of being rated 1,2 and 3. Only 7 questionnaires that were incomplete of these 19, had no reason given for not being complete. No further follow-up was made because of the time and expense involved.

E. Statistical Procedure

Mrs. C. Prokop of the Department of Educational Administration designed a Fortran computer programme to compile the data essential to this study. The initial step involved identifying the respondent's primary value orientation which was defined as moralistic, affective, pragmatic or mixed. England (1975) stated that "moralistic" persons are "characterized by concepts viewed as high in importance and right", while "pragmatic" persons are "characterized by concepts viewed as high in importance and successful". "Affective" persons are "characterized by concepts viewed as high in importance and pleasant" and those persons who are "characterized by no clearly identifiable primary orientation" are classified as having a "mixed" value orientation. (Padfield,1979,p.78)

England's (1975) procedure for analysis was utilized and the concepts listed as "high importance" were grouped into successful, right or pleasant and conditional probabilities computed in the following steps:

1. The first step was to identify the individual's "largest conditional probability":

$p(S/HI)$
$p(R/HI)$
$p(P/HI)$

where terms inside the parentheses are:

S = Successful
R = Right
P = Pleasant
HI= High Importance

2. The second step involved comparing the largest conditional probability to its complement. England (1975) stated:

> If, for example, the largest conditional probability selected in the first step was $P(S/HI)$, its complement is the probability of responding successful, given a rating of average importance, and low importance, or, that is, $P(S/\overline{HI})$, where HI refers to average importance plus low importance. (pp.159-160)

If $P(S/HI)$ was greater than its complement $P(S/\overline{HI})$, then an individual's primary orientation was considered to be pragmatic. If the complement probability was greater, a mixed value orientation was assigned. Also, if an individual's primary orientation accounted for less than 15 percent of the total concepts on the PVQ, the individual was classified as having a mixed value orientation. (Padfield,1979) To calculate an individual's primary orientation, the decision rules in Figure 1 were followed. Value profiles were produced by reporting the percentage of individuals within the group listed as pragmatic, moralistic, affective or mixed.

Further analysis consisted of examining the concepts for each individual in terms of value type, either "operative, "intended", "adopted" or "weak". To do this, the individual's primary value orientation was used as a base. "Operative" values were concepts which fit an individual's primary orientation and were rated as "high importance". "Intended values" were those concepts rated as "high importance" but did not fit the individual's "primary value orientation". Concepts which fit the individual's "primary value orientation" but did not rate as "high importance" were termed "adopted values", and the remaining concepts rated "average" or "low" importance and which did not fit the person's primary value orientation were termed as "weak" values.

Excluding those people with mixed value orientations, a value profile was constructed for each individual. England (1975), in referring to mixed value orientations stated:

> This exclusion is necessary because the probability scores used in the classification procedure cannot be computed for managers with a mixed value orientation. (p.22)

Having obtained an individual value profile, a group value profile was constructed by aggregating all of the relevant individual profiles. (Padfield,1979) A "Behavioral

FIGURE 1

DECISION RULES USED FOR CALCULATING AN INDIVIDUAL'S PRIMARY VALUE ORIENTATION CLASSIFICATION

Primary Value Orientation	Decision Rule
Pragmatic	$P(S/HI)$ is the largest $P(S/HI) > P(S/\overline{HI})$
Moralistic	$P(R/HI)$ is the largest $P(R/HI) > P(R/\overline{HI})$
Affect	$P(P/HI)$ is the largest $P(P/HI) > P(P/\overline{HI})$

Note: In all cases, if the complement probability is greater than its principal, it would imply a mixed value orientation.

* From Padfield (1979, p.80).

Relevance Score" (England,1975) was then calculated for each concept. The Behavioral Relevance Score (BRS) was calculated by multiplying the operative value score by three, intended value score by two and the adopted value score by one. The sum of these scores was divided by three to obtain the BRS. A Group Value Profile Matrix" combining the "overall value profile " and the "Behavioral Relevance Score" was then constructed, to examine the similarities and differences present in the group value profiles. This procedure was utilized for all groups in terms of placement in value type and operative value score.

In order to examine value hierarchies, Padfield (1979) stated that:

> research has indicated that a hierarchy of values exists in any value system which reveals the degree of relative importance of each value. (p.84)

Therefore, the 69 concepts were rank ordered using their Behavioral Relevance Scores. Spearman Correlation Coefficients were produced to examine the degree of similarity in the value hierarchies of the groups.

Padfield (1979) utilized the Average Deviation Score in order to examine the question of homogeneity and heterogeneity of value systems. England (1975) stated of this procedure that "the deviation measure essentially gets at the meaning similarity of responses to each concept." (p.40). This procedure utilizes the percentage response to each value type. To obtain the deviation measure, the value type with the highest percentage is

selected and the differences calculated by multiplying the percentage by the relative distance (range) of each value from the highest percentage. An example might be:
If the percentage operative score is .40, intended .10, adopted .25 and weak .25, the average deviation score would be calculated thus;
Average Deviation Score

$$= (1 \times .10)+(2 \times .25)+(3 \times .25)$$

$$= 1.35$$

According to England (1975) Average Deviation Scores (AD Scores)

> can vary from zero (if 100 percent of the responses were of one value type) to 1.65 (if the responses split were 34 percent, zero percent, 33 percent, 33 percent for the value type respectively.) (p.42)

Low scores indicated homogeneous value systems while high scores indicated heterogeneous value systems. Mean average deviation scores were calculated for each group and the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the value systems of the three groups were compared and contrasted.

To further examine the question of homogeneity and heterogeneity of the value systems, an F-test was performed to test whether the variances associated with each concept were different. Padfield (1979) used Glass and Stanley's (1970) .10 level of significance for the F-test. Padfield (1979) noted that the utilization of the F-test enabled the researcher to find if there was "a statistically significant difference in the homogeneity of the groups' responses to a specific concept" (p.84). Both methods were utilized as the Average Deviation Score provided insight into the meaning similarity of responses and F-tests provided significant differences between the groups on homogeneity and heterogeneity of responses to specific concepts.

F. Summary

Chapter 3 has outlined the methodology and procedure used in the collection and analysis of data for the study. The questionnaire, the returns, and the statistical procedures used in analysis of the data collected, have been described.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the analysis of data focussing on the question of similarity and/or differences in the personal value systems of male and female administrators and female teachers on Prince Edward Island. The demographic information and statistical treatment and results are described in relation to the research questions posed.

A. Analysis of the Sample

The sample consisted of 577 individuals, 461 teachers, 90 male administrators and 26 female administrators. Female teachers comprised 79.8% of the total sample, while female and male administrators comprised 4.5% and 15.6% of the sample respectively.

In a comparison by position within the administrative groups, as shown in Table 4, 53% males were principals while 34% were vice-principals and 12% were consultants/coordinators. Within the female administrative group, 19% were principals, 65% vice-principals and 15% consultants and coordinators.

As can be seen in Table 5, between group comparison by position illustrates that 90% males were principals and 10% females were principals. Sixty-five percent and 35% males and females were vice-principals, while 63% and 86% males and 38% and 14% females were consultants/coordinators

TABLE 4

WITHIN GROUP COMPARISON BY POSITION- MALE AND FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS (*)

	Male N=90	Female N=25
Principal	53%	19%
Vice-Principal	34%	65%
Consultant/Co-ordinator	12%	15%

* Rounded to nearest whole percentage at .5 and up.

TABLE 5

BETWEEN GROUP COMPARISON BY POSITION- MALE AND FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS (*)

	Male N=90	Female N=25
Principal	91%	10%
Vice-Principal	65%	35%
Consultant	63%	38%
Co-ordinator	86%	14%

* Rounded to nearest whole percentage at .5 and up.

respectively. Overall, in a comparison of the groups, it may be seen that the male administrators far outnumbered the female administrators, with the majority of men being principals and the minority of women being principals.

Of the total administrative group, the majority (51.1%) of male administrators were between the ages of 35 and 45 while 32.2% were in the 25-34 year old range. The majority of women administrators (34.6%) were in the 46-55 year old range with 26.9% in each of the 25-34 and 35-44 year old range.

It appears that women administrators were older than male administrators with 56.1% being between the ages of 46 and 50, while this age group accounted for only 16.7% of male administrators. There were no administrators in the 20-24 year old range. Further breakdown of the male administrative group indicates that 83.3% were under the age of 45 while only 53.8% women administrators were under the age of 45. The majority of women teachers appear in the 25-34 year range for a total of 40.7%. (see Table 6)

The majority of male administrators were married for a total of 96.7% compared with 73.1% female administrators and 69.9% female teachers. 23.1% female administrators and 22.9% female teachers were single as compared to 3.3% male administrators. No administrator was widowed or separated and one female administrator was divorced. A small percentage of female teachers were widowed, divorced or separated.

TABLE 6

PERCENT ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS BY AGE

Age	Male Administrators N=90	Female Administrators N=25	Teachers N=454
20 - 24 years			3.1
25 - 34 years	32.2	26.9	40.7
35 - 44 years	51.1	26.9	27.7
45 - 54 years	13.4	34.6	17.0
Over 55 years	3.3	11.5	11.4

In terms of educational background, a larger percentage of female administrators (28%) had no degree when compared with 6.7% male administrators. It is interesting to note that 36.5% female teachers had no degree. Of the total group of female administrators, 32% held two bachelors degrees while 6.7% males had one degree and 40% had two degrees. 23.1% and 27.2% female teachers had one and two bachelors degrees respectively. Thirty-six percent female administrators, 43.3% male administrators and 5.8% female teachers had masters degrees. No person in the sample held a Doctorate. The "Other" category accounted for 4% and 3.3% male and female administrators and 8.3% teachers. As has been traditionally the case, it appears that women have not pursued their education to the same extent as the men. (see Table 7)

The response to the question on job satisfaction, illustrated in Table 8, indicates that there were no administrators and only .9% women teachers who were not satisfied with their jobs. Only 1.1% and 1.3% male administrators and female teachers were indifferent to their jobs. A total of 19.2% and 46.2% female administrators liked, or were enthusiatic about their jobs while 33.3% and 48.9% males and 28.3 and 42.8% teachers liked or were enthusiastic about their jobs. Women administrators (30.8%), male administrators (14.4%) and female teachers (24.8%) expressed that they loved their jobs. It appears that a greater percentage of women were willing to express extreme

TABLE 7

PERCENT EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND (3 GROUPS)

	Male Administrators N = 90	Female Administrators N = 25	Teachers N = 445
No Degree	6.7	28.0	35.5
Bachelor's Degree	6.7	0.0	23.1
Bachelor's and B.Ed. Degrees	40.0	32.0	27.2
Master's Degree	43.3	36.0	5.8
Other	3.3	4.0	8.3

TABLE 8

PERCENT JOB SATISFACTION BY GROUP

	Male Administrators	Female Administrators	Female * Teachers
Dislike	0.0	0.0	0.9
Indifferent	1.1	0.0	1.3
Like	33.3	19.2	28.3
Enthusiastic	48.9	46.2	42.8
Love	14.4	30.8	24.8
Would Rather Not Respond	2.2	3.8	2.0

* N = 460/461

satisfaction with their jobs, particularly women administrators.

As may be seen in Table 9, which represents the response to the question posed regarding how the individual felt about an administrative position, the majority of women teachers (63.8%) stated that they would dislike an administrative position while only 1.6% would actually seek such a position. Just over 29% would not refuse the position if it were offered to them. The majority of female administrators indicated that they liked their position and 15.4% actively sought it while 11.5% did not like their positions. Within the group of male administrators, most males indicated that they liked their positions and 25% actually sought them. Only 12.5% indicated that they were offered their positions. A minority of women administrators, 2.3%, did not like their positions.

From this information it may be seen that women are less inclined than men to apply for administrative positions and are less satisfied with them when they receive an appointment. It also seems to indicate that they would rather be offered an administrative position than actively seek one.

No female administrator replying to the questionnaire was in a position in a high school. The majority (95.5%), were in elementary schools, with 23.5% males in high school administrative positions, 23.5% in junior high and 53.1% in elementary schools. A total of 47.7% of the male

TABLE 9

PERCENT RESPONSE TO QUESTION ON FEELINGS ABOUT AN IN-SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION-BY GROUP

	Male Administrators N = 88	Female Administrators N = 26	Teachers N = 447
Hate	0.0	0.0	8.5
Dislike	2.3	11.5	55.3
Not Seek-Not Refuse If Offered	12.5	30.8	29.3
Like	60.2	42.3	5.4
Actively Seek	25.0	15.4	1.6

administrators held positions in secondary schools compared with 4.5% females. Of the female administrators who held in-school administrative positions, 90.5% taught over 60% of the time. Only one woman administrator who held an in-school administrative position did not teach, compared with 18.9%, or twelve males.

Just under one-third of the male administrators taught more than 60% of the time. With 76.2% female administrators and 12.9% of male administrators teaching more than 80% of the time, this indicated that women administrators are basically teachers with administrative duties to perform. As the majority of of women administrators (70.8%) were in small rural elementary schools, held vice-principalships and taught most of the time, the question as to whether they are truly teachers or administrators, may be posed. (see Table 10)

It may therefore be seen by the descriptive data, that the majority of women administrators in in-school positions taught most of the time. They were inclined to be older than male administrators and by far the largest percentage were situated in elementary schools as vice-principals, and were more willing to express dissatisfaction with their positions. A greater percentage of female administrators were single and their academic qualifications, overall, were not as high as those of their male counterparts.

TABLE 10

PERCENT TIME SPENT IN ACTUAL CLASSROOM TEACHING (IN-SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ONLY)

Percent Time	Male N = 62/74	Female N = 21/22
1 - 20	17.7	4.8
21 - 40	24.2	4.8
41 - 60	27.4	0.0
61 - 80	17.7	14.3
81 - 100	12.9	76.2

62/74 Male Administrators teach
21/22 Female Administrators teach

B. Primary Orientation of the Groups

The three groups, female administrators, male administrators and female teachers, were compared in terms of the primary value orientations of the individuals in each group. England (1975) stated:

> The essential purpose of this classification is to provide a means of eliminating the intentionality of values and getting closer to values that are behaviorally relevant.(p.19)

Each individual was classified as pragmatic, moralistic, affective or mixed in their evaluation of the 69 concepts on the questionnaire. England (1975) and Padfield (1979) stated that pragmatists evaluate on the basis of whether something will work and if it will be successful, while moralists evaluate in terms of whether something is right or wrong. Affective individuals evaluate importance in terms of whether something is pleasant or not. Mixed orientations occur when an individual cannot be clearly placed into any one of the other three categories. An illustration of the Primary Value Orientation of the three groups in the study is presented in Table 11.

Just over half the women administrators were moralistic, while slightly under three-fifths of the male administrators and female teachers were moralistic. Female administrators appeared to be more pragmatic than either the male administrators or teachers. The largest percentage of affective individuals (5.6%) were male administrators while female administrators were the least affective group. Female teachers accounted for the highest percentage of individuals

TABLE 11

PERCENT PRIMARY VALUE ORIENTATION OF MALE AND FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS AND FEMALE TEACHERS

Group	Moralistic	Affective	Pragmatic	Mixed
Female Administrators N=26	53.8	3.8	23.1	19.2
Male Administrators N=90	57.8	5.6	17.8	18.9
Female Teachers N=461	58.4	4.1	15.8	21.7

in the mixed category and male administrators for the least.

Within the primary value orientations of the three groups, the largest and most interesting difference occurred between the female administrators and female teachers, with 7.3% more female administrators being pragmatic. One is led to question if this difference occurred because of the position or perhaps that more pragmatic females may be interested in advancing within their profession. The smallest percentage difference occurred between the male administrators and female teachers in the affective orientation at .5% difference.

C. Group Value Profile

In order to construct a group value profile, each individual's primary value orientation and the responses to each concept, were used. The four categories of values-operative, intended, adopted and weak were described by England (1975). He stated that operative values are those concepts which are rated as high importance and fit the individual's primary value orientation. These values are most important as they have the greatest impact on a person's behavior.

Intended values are those rated as high importance, however they do not fit the individual's primary orientation. England (1975) stated that "these values seem generally to be socioculturally induced" (p.21). Adopted values fit the individual's primary value orientation but are not considered as highly important and are situationally induced. Intended and adopted values have less impact on behavior respectively, while weak values, classed as neither being highly important, nor fitting the individual's primary value orientation, according to Padfield (1979), are "expected to play the least important role in guiding an individual's behavior"(p.94). (see Appendix G for Analysis of Concept Response)

As England's (1975) classification procedure does not compute for individuals with a mixed value orientation, these individuals were eliminated from the study at this point. An overall value profile was compiled by aggregating the individual value classifications (operative, intended, adopted or weak) into group profiles. Mixed value orientations accounted for 19.2% female administrators, 18.9% male administrators and 21.7% female teachers, reducing the N for each group in the sample approximately twenty percent.

A Behavioral Relevance Score (BRS) was obtained and recorded. Operative values were weighted 3, intended values 2, adopted values 1 and weak values 0. The sum of the product of each was then divided by 3 and a BRS for each concept obtained with a possible range of 0-100.

Each concept was then categorized as operative, intended, adopted or weak by utilizing the highest percentage assigned to the concept by the group. If the two highest percentages rating the concept in any of the four categories did not have a ten percent difference, the concept was assigned to a fifth or "mixed" category. Introduction of the ten percent decision rule was felt necessary because with the small number of female administrators, a change in position by even one individual might mean a change in the concept rating of the whole group.

D. Personal Value Sytems of the Groups

Female Administrators

The following list presents the value profile for the Female Administrators in the study.

OPERATIVE VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
90	Trust
89	Self-discipline
87	Competency
86	Loyalty
84	Fairness
82	Job Satisfaction
81	Integrity
79	Student Welfare
77	Professional Growth
75	Efficiency
73	Equal Educational Opportunity, Parents
72	Ethical Behavior, Instruction
71	Value System, Achievement, Dignity
69	Optimization of Student Potential
68	Consistency
67	Organizational Effectiveness
65	Intellectual Growth
64	Principals
63	Academic Skills, Self-Actualization
59	Teacher and Staff Welfare
57	Objectivity
56	Individuality

55	Education, Educational Stability

INTENDED VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
70	My Co-workers
64	Ambition
61	Initiative

ADOPTED VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
34	Professional Organizations
29	Me

WEAK VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
43	Security
34	Scholarship
33	School Board
31	Autonomy
30	Teacher Unions
29	Creativity
28	Department of Education
27	Superintendents, Consultants
25	Change
21	Committees
17	Power
15	Influence, Prestige
13	Professional Prominence, Conformity, Risk, Competition
12	Conflict
10	Income
8	Aggressiveness

MIXED VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
80	Co-operation
75	Compassion
73	Student Body
70	Accountability

58	Equality
57	Ability
53	Program Articulation, Decisiveness
48	Success, Tolerance
47	Rationality
40	Intelligence
32	Authority
22	Compromise

The operative values listed indicate that Female Administrators have accepted the goals of educational organizations. All concepts except Program Articulation, which falls into the "mixed" category, are operative values for this group. It appears that female administrators are humanists. The concepts Trust, Loyalty, Fairness, Integrity, Dignity and others seem to illustrate this, as they are all operative values.

An ethical-moral orientation is shown by the operative values Ethical Behavior, Value System, Integrity and Dignity.

Female administrators seem to have adopted a "collegial" rather than a "bureaucratic" orientation to their jobs. Principals, Parents, Teacher and Staff Welfare, Student Welfare, all appear as operative values. Although Student Body and Cooperation appear in the mixed category, both their BRS's are relatively high, seeming to indicate that they are operative or adopted values for the majority of female administrators without a clear majority being either.

The female administrators valued Efficiency, Instruction, Staff and Student Welfare, indicating a "service orientation". As Power, Security and Success appear as either "weak" or "mixed values" with low Behavioral Relevance Scores, there seems to be an indication of this orientation. As Committees, Compromise and Authority have little behavioral relevance, a slight indication of "paternalism" seems to be present. With Co-workers, Ambition and Initiative as the only intended values, one might assume that these values only become important when the are socioculturally induced. Padfield (1979) stated that:

> the extent to which this '... orientation' becomes behaviorally operative probably depends on the environmental and situational climate in which the individual is operating. (p.100)

Female administrators appeared to value Job Satisfaction, Achievement and Self-Actualization while the adopted values, Professional Organization and Me become behaviorally operative, only when the situation calls for it. The nature of the concept Professional Organization indicates that as in most professions, this concept becomes important in only certain circumstances and at certain times. The low rating of the concept Me seems to indicate that women are still not sure of their own abilities and do not value themselves highly in what appears to be a male-dominated field.

The low rating of the concepts Aggressiveness, Income, Conflict and Power indicated that the female administrator rejects what are considered ways and means of material gain.

This appears to be an assertion of the strong "moralistic" orientation of the group.

In characterizing the Female Administrator on Prince Edward Island, one might list in a value profile that they have:

1. a strong ethical-moral orientation
2. internalized the organizational goals
3. a humanistic orientation
4. a collegial orientation to significant groups within the school environment
5. a degree of service orientation
6. an intended ambition orientation
7. an adopted orientation to the Professional Organization and self
8. rejection of the "Materialistic rat race" as described by Flowers et al. (1975)

Male Administrators

The following list illustrates a value profile of male administrators showing the Behavioral Relevance Score (BRS) for each concept and categorizes each concept into operative, intended, adopted weak or mixed values.

OPERATIVE VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
87	Fairness
86	Student Welfare
85	Instruction
83	Trust, Parents, Equal Educational Opportunity
82	Loyalty

79	Student Body
78	Accountability, Integrity
77	Ethical Behavior
75	Competency
73	Dignity, Equality
72	Consistency, Optimization of Student Potential
71	Value System
69	Self-discipline, Initiative
68	Efficiency
66	Ambition
64	Co-operation
63	Professional Growth
61	Compassion
59	Achievement
57	Objectivity, Organizational Effectiveness
56	Teacher and Staff Welfare

INTENDED VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
76	Job Satisfaction
64	Success

ADOPTED VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
	None

WEAK VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
39	Security
37	Compromise
34	Intelligence
31	Change, Scholarship
29	Creativity
28	Autonomy, Professional Organizations
27	Consultants
25	Income, Influence
24	Department of Education
21	Committees, Risk
18	Teacher Unions
17	Prestige, Competition
16	Aggressiveness, Conflict
15	Professional Prominence
12	Power

11	Conformity

MIXED VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
75	My Co-workers
60	Me
57	Self-Actualization
56	Decisiveness
54	Organizational Stability, Intellectual Growth
53	Program Articulation
52	Ability
51	Principals
49	Education, Academic Skills
48	Tolerance
47	Individuality
45	Superintendents
41	Authority
39	School Board

The operative values listed appear to show that male administrators as a group have accepted the goals of educational organizations. Instruction, Equal Educational Opportunity, Teacher and Staff Welfare and Optimization of Student Potential are some of the concepts relating to these goals and are all highly behaviorally relevant.

A humanistic orientation is indicated as Fairness, Trust, Loyalty and Integrity are only some of the operative values. The male administrator appears to be success oriented as Ambition and Success are rated as operative and intended values. However, Income, Power, Professional Prominence or Influence are all seen as weak values. The weakness of these concepts shows a rejection of the material. The ethical-moral orientation is shown in the operative values Trust, Fairness, Ethical Behavior and Value System. Also included are Loyalty and Integrity. Male Administrators also rated Parents, Student Body and Teacher and Staff Welfare as highly operative values. Department of Education and Committees are listed as weak values and Principals, Superintendents and School Boards as mixed values with Behavioral Relevance Scores of less than 50 seemingly indicating a collegial staff perspective and perhaps a degree of rejection of authority from outside the school. The concepts Me and My Co-workers were also mixed, however, their relevance scores were greater than 50 which indicated no clear majority of response in either the operative or intended categories. Depending on environment, these values might be considered behaviorally operative at times.

The outstanding characteristics of the male administrators' value profile appear to be:

1. Internalized goals of the organization
2. Humanistic orientation
3. Achievement oriented
4. Strongly ethical-moral
5. Intended success orientation
6. Rejects materialism

This value profile suggests that as an administrator, the male administrator would be designated "sociocentric" or "existential" by Flowers et al. (1975) which indicates concern "where goals and problems are more important than money and prestige associated with the position" (p.2).

Female Teachers

Following is an illustration of the value profile of female teachers on Prince Edward Island and shows the Behavioral Relevance Score (BRS) for each concept. It also categorizes each concept into operative, intended, adopted , weak or mixed values.

OPERATIVE VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
90	Trust
88	Fairness
83	Loyalty
82	Student Welfare
81	Instruction
81	Integrity
77	Parents, Equal Educational Opportunity
76	Self-discipline
75	Efficiency
72	Consistency, Ethical Behavior, Teacher and Staff Welfare, Optimization of Student Potential
70	Co-operation
69	Equality
65	Dignity, Achievement, Competency, Compassion
64	Student Body
62	Professional Growth, Academic Skills, Value System, Accountability, Me
60	Intellectual Growth
57	Principals
56	Tolerance

INTENDED VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
	None

ADOPTED VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
34	Professional Organizations

WEAK VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
48	Success
47	Intelligence
43	Decisiveness
42	Objectivity
38	Department of Education
37	Compromise
33	Superintendents
32	School Board, Teacher Unions
30	Change
29	Autonomy
26	Income
24	Creativity
22	Scholarship
21	Consultants
20	Committees
19	Risk
18	Professional Prominence
17	Competition
16	Prestige, Influence, Conflict
15	Conformity
13	Aggressiveness
8	Power

MIXED VALUES

BRS	CONCEPT
75	Job Satisfaction
62	My Co-workers
57	Security
55	Ambition, Organizational Stability
54	Individuality
53	Education, Initiative
52	Ability, Organizational Effectiveness
51	Rationality
50	Self-Actualization
45	Program Articulation
36	Authority

The operative values of female teachers suggest that they have internalized the goals of the educational organization, especially those goals dealing with Students, Student Welfare, Instruction and Equal Educational Opportunity. Teachers appear to value Parents, Student Body, Me and Principals hierarchically. This appears to denote more involvement with the actual in-school situation as Superintendents, School Board, Consultants and Department of Education all appear as weak values.

Female teachers appear to confirm their moralistic orientation by having placed high relevance on Ethical Behavior, Value Systems, Accountability, Integrity and Loyalty.

A humanistic orientation is indicated in the values Trust, Fairness, Co-operation, Compassion, Tolerance, Dignity and Integrity.

Female teachers also appear to reject materialism. Success, Prestige, Income and Influence are all seen as weak values, denoting a degree of altruism in their value systems.

Although Job Satisfaction and My Co-workers appear as mixed values, both have Behavioral Relevance Scores greater than fifty, indicating that the individuals see these concepts as either operative or intended indicating their strength as behaviorally relevant.

Aggressiveness and Power are rated the lowest and appear to have very little, if any behavioral relevance for female teachers.

The only adopted value clearly discernible, Professional Organizations, appears to have little influence on group behavior, although such a value at times may be environmentally induced. Collective bargaining with the government for a new contract, the introduction of a new course offering, or enlisting professional services from an outside agency to deal with a specific in-school problem are examples.

The female teachers clearly reject materialism as Income, Autonomy, Change, Risk, Initiative and Prestige are all either weak or mixed values with low BRS's.

The outstanding characteristics of female teachers are:

1. Internalized educational goals which are directed specifically towards the student and staff within the school environment.
2. A humanistic orientation
3. Hierarchical orientation to relevant groups with Parents as the most important
4. Strong ethical-moral orientation
5. Non-materialistic.

This value profile suggests that in terms of personal values, as employees, the female teachers would be designated as 'existential' by Flowers et al.(1975) exhibiting goals and problems as more important in their value systems than the money and prestige associated with it.

E. Comparison of the Value Profiles

By Group Value Type

It would appear from the above discussion that the value profiles of Female Administrators, Male Administrators and Female Teachers are relatively similar.

Comparison between the Male and Female Administrators shows 65.2%, or 45 of 69 concepts classified the same by these two groups. 24 or 34.8% were classified differently. These 24 concepts are shown in Table 12. The table illustrates that behaviorally there appear to be significant differences in the combination of operative and non-operative concepts which have high Behavioral Relevance Scores, but for a lack of a clear majority of responses, have been designated to the 'mixed' category. As may be seen, Table 13 depicts concepts classified as 'Mixed' and which have concepts with categories showing greater than 10% difference in BRS. It should be noted that all 'mixed' value labels show the highest percentage in terms of group response by category, and that most are a combination of operative values with another category which gives a larger than 50 BRS.

This table illustrates that although the two groups, male and female administrators have 24 concepts between value type that are different, only 9 appear to be behaviorally significantly different as to value type difference. To this point it appears that the value systems

TABLE 12

BETWEEN GROUP COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATORS BY CONCEPTS CLASSIFIED DIFFERENTLY

Concept	Female Administrators BRS	Male Administrators BRS	Difference BRS
Ambition	64	66	2
Intelligence	40	34	6
Compassion	75	61	14
Co-operation	80	63	17
Initiative	61	69	8
Individuality	56	47	9
Job Satisfaction	82	76	6
Education	55	49	6
Success	48	64	16
Self-Actualization	63	57	6
Intellectual Growth	65	54	11
School Board	33	39	6
Superintendents	27	45	18
Me	29	60	31
Prof. Organizations	34	28	6
My Co-workers	70	75	5
Principals	64	51	13
Student Body	73	79	6
Org. Stability	55	54	1
Academic Skills	63	49	14
Accountability	70	78	8
Compromise	23	37	14
Equality	58	73	15
Rationality	47	66	19

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATORS OF BEHAVIOURALLY RELEVANT CONCEPTS CLASSIFIED AS "MIXED" WITH > 10 DIFFERENCE IN BRS AND > 50 BRS (*)

Concept	Female Administrators	Male Administrators	Difference BRS
Compassion	75(I/O)**	61(O)	14
Co-operation	80(O/I)	64(O)	16
Success	48(O/I)	64(I)	16
Intellectual Growth	65(O)	54(O/W)	11
Me	29(A)	60(O/I)	31
Principals	64(O)	51(O/W)	13
Academic Skills	63(O)	49(O/W)	14
Rationality	47(O/A)	66(O)	19
Equality	58(O/A)	73(O)	15

* O = Operative Value.
I = Intended Value.
A = Adopted Value
W = Weak Value.

** Highest category given first; two categories indicate a "Mixed" group value

are still similar, with only 9 concepts showing relevant behavioral differences.

The same process was utilized to compare the value profiles of Female Administrators and Female Teachers. Of the 69 concepts, 23 or 33.3%, were classified differently. Only 6 concepts appeared to significantly vary by a 10% difference in BRS of those concepts rated as mixed by at least one group. Both Table 14 and Table 15 illustrate the differences in the two groups' rating of concepts. Overall, this would seem to indicate that for these concepts not rated the same (operative, intended, adopted or weak) there appears to be very little difference behaviorally in the value systems of Female Teachers and Administrators.

As may be seen in Table 16, Female Teachers and Male Administrators categorized 17 concepts differently. This accounts for 24.6% difference and 75.4% similarity between the groups. Only 8 values are listed differently between these groups in terms of behavioral relevance.

It may be seen that the greatest number of differences occurred between the Female Administrators and the Male Administrators and the least between the Female Teachers and the Male Administrators (see Table 17). The least number of behaviorally relevant differences between the value groupings occurred between the Female Administrators and the Female Teachers, followed by the Male Administrators and the Female Teachers.

Compassion, Co-operation and Equality are seen in the

TABLE 14

BETWEEN GROUP COMPARISON OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS AND FEMALE TEACHERS BY CONCEPTS CLASSIFIED DIFFERENTLY

Concept	Female Administrators BRS	Female Teachers BRS	Difference BRS
Ambition	64	55	9
Intelligence	75	37	3
Compassion	75	65	10
Co-operation	80	70	10
Tolerance	48	56	8
Initiative	61	53	8
Decisiveness	53	43	10
Objectivity	57	42	15
Individuality	56	54	2
Job-satisfaction	82	75	7
Security	43	57	14
Education	55	53	2
Success	48	48	0
Self-actualization	63	50	13
Me	29	62	33
Prof. Organizations	34	27	7
My Co-Workers	70	62	8
Student body	73	64	9
Org. Stability	55	55	0
Org. Effectiveness	67	52	15
Accountability	70	62	8
Compromise	23	37	14
Equality	58	69	11

TABLE 15

COMPARISON OF FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS AND FEMALE TEACHERS OF BEHAVIOURALLY RELEVANT CONCEPTS CLASSIFIED AS "MIXED" WITH > 10 DIFFERENCE IN BRS AND > 50 BRS

Concept	Female Administrators	Female Teachers	Difference BRS
Compassion	75(O/I)**	65(O)	10
Co-operation	80(O/I)	70(O)	10
Self-actualization	63(O)	50(W/O)	13
Org. Effectiveness	67(O)	52(O/W)	15
Equality	69(O)	58(O/A)	11
Security	43(W)	57(O/I)	14

* O = Operative Value.
I = Intended Value.
A = Adopted Value
W = Weak Value.

** Highest category given first; two categories indicate a "Mixed" group value

TABLE 16

BETWEEN GROUP COMPARISON OF MALE ADMINISTRATORS AND FEMALE TEACHERS BY CONCEPTS CLASSIFIED DIFFERENTLY

Concept	Male Administrators BRS	Female Teachers BRS	Difference BRS
Ambition	66	55	11
Tolerance	48	56	12
Initiative	68	52	16
Decisiveness	56	43	13
Objectivity	57	42	15
Job Satisfaction	76	75	1
Security	39	57	18
Success	64	48	16
Intellectual Growth	54	60	6
School Board	39	32	7
Superintendents	45	33	12
Me	60	62	2
Prof. Organizations	28	27	1
Principals	51	57	6
Academic Skills	49	62	13
Org. Effectiveness	57	52	5
Rationality	66	51	15

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF MALE ADMINISTRATORS AND FEMALE TEACHERS OF BEHAVIOURALLY RELEVANT CONCEPTS CLASSIFIED AS "MIXED" WITH > 10 DIFFERENCE IN BRS AND > 50 BRS

Concept	Male Administrators	Female Teachers	Difference BRS
Ambition	66(O)**	55(O/I)	11
Initiative	69(O)	53(O/W)	16
Decisiveness	56(O/I)	43(W)	13
Objectivity	57(O)	42(W/O)	15
Security	39(W)	57(O/I)	18
Success	64(I)	48(W/I)	16
Academic Skills	62(O)	48(O/W)	14
Rationality	66(O)	51(O/W)	15

* O = Operative Value.
I = Intended Value.
A = Adopted Value
W = Weak Value.

** Highest category given first; two categories indicate a "Mixed" group value

list of Female and Male Administrators and the Female Administrators and Teachers. Academic Skills and Equality both appear on the list of differences between Male Administrators and Female Administrators and Female Teachers and Male Administrators.

Further similarities and differences in the group profiles will be examined in the next section. In order to do this, the actual percentage of each group and its rating of the operative value category will be utilized to investigate each concept. England (1975) stated that the utilization of either the comparison of Behavioral Relevance Scores or the actual percentage rating of operative value scores, was highly correlated at the .97 and .99 levels. It was decided to use both to provide as much information as was possible in the comparison of the value systems of the groups.

By Operative Value Scores

Each group was broken down in its grouping of concepts for this analysis. The operative responses given for Ideas Associated With People, Personal Goals of the Individual, Groups of People, Goals of the Educational Organization and Ideas About General Topics were utilized. The N is reduced from the original number as England's (1975) methodology does not compute for individuals with Mixed Value Orientations as has already been stated.

According to England, a ten percent difference in operative value score is "both statistically and practically significant"(p.30). Operative value scores of greater than 50, which indicate that more than 50 percent of the group has designated the concept operative, would be extremely significant in all probability to that group in behavioral terms. Concepts denoted less than 10 in operative value score, in all probability would have little influence behaviorally on the group, as 10 percent or less have designated the concept operative. Intermediary values, between 49 and 11 percent, become operative only when situationally or environmentally induced.

Tables 18-22 were designed to show the differences in the operative value scores of each group. The breakdown in category was done as it was in the questionnaire. In order to make the interpretation of the data easier, scores (percentages) which differed by more than 10 percent, have an asterisk to designate a concept as having a greater than ten percent difference, which according to England (1975) and Padfield (1979) shows behaviorally relevant significance. Operative value scores greater than 50 indicate high behavioral significance.

The operative value scores for the concepts categorized as "Ideas Associated With People" are shown in Table 18. In the comparison of Female and Male Administrators, 5 concepts differed by 10% or more. These concepts are Ambition, Integrity, Initiative, Self-discipline and Competency. The concepts Ambition, Integrity and Initiative are more

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF OPERATIVE SCORES

Group 1 = Female Administrators N=21
Group 2 = Male Administrators N=73
Group 3 = Female Teachers N=361

IDEAS ASSOCIATED WITH PEOPLE

Concept	Operative Value Score Group 1	2	3	Difference in Operative Value Score Group (1,2)	(1,3)	(2,3)
Ambition	29	44	32	15*	3	12*
Ability	29	32	28	3	1	4
Intelligence	10	17	18	7	8	1
Trust	68	63	74	5	6	11*
Aggressiveness	0	7	3	7	3	4
Loyalty	62	65	68	3	6	3
Integrity	52	64	65	12*	13*	1
Compassion	43	44	46	1	3	2
Fairness	62	70	73	8	11*	3
Co-operation	48	41	48	7	0	7
Tolerance	29	33	40	4	11*	7
Conformity	5	4	3	1	2	1
Creativity	10	14	10	4	0	4
Initiative	29	44	30	15*	1	14*
Decisiveness	29	33	22	4	7	11*
Objectivity	38	38	25	0	13*	13*
Self-discipline	76	52	57	24*	19*	5
Competency	68	49	43	19*	25*	6

* Indicates significant difference > 10 Operative Value Score

behaviorally relevant for Male Administrators than Female Administrators, which seems to confirm the notion that males are more ambitious than females in terms of their career goals. They appear to be willing to take the initiative to seek out their positions and they value the integrity that an advanced position provides.

Female Administrators find the concepts Self-discipline and Competency more behaviorally relevant than the Male Administrators. One possible explanation is that women in administrative positions feel they must prove that they are competent to hold the position in a traditionally male-oriented field and that in order to keep this position they must maintain a great deal of Self-discipline, so as not to be stereotyped as an emotional female.

Both groups place a high degree of value on Trust, Loyalty and Fairness indicating the strong ethical-moral and humanistic orientation. Although Ambition does not appear as a highly operative value, male administrators appear to value ambition more than the female administrators.

Relatively little difference is seen in the way male administrators and female administrators view the concepts Ability, Compassion, Co-operation, Tolerance, Decisiveness and Objectivity. Both groups place extremely low relevance behaviorally on the concepts Intelligence, Conformity and Creativity, which would have little influence on their value systems.

Female teachers and female administrators seem to differ significantly on the concepts Integrity, Fairness, Tolerance, Objectivity, Self-discipline and Competency. As the concepts Self-discipline and Competency were rated higher by the female administrators, it appears to indicate that because of their position as administrators, this may have some influence on their view of these concepts. Women teachers value Fairness, Tolerance, Integrity and Objectivity more highly than their female counterparts in administration. Tolerance is not seen as being extremely behaviorally relevant to either group. Both groups placed high behavioral relevance on Trust and Loyalty, with very little behavioral relevance on Aggressiveness, Conformity and Creativity. Both groups of females placed little importance on the concept Ambition.

Male Administrators placed higher relevance behaviorally on Ambition, Initiative, Decisiveness and Objectivity than female teachers, while female teachers valued Trust more than males. The rating of these concepts appears to follow the traditional patterns of males and females and the degree of importance placed on the concepts by each sex.

In the overall comparison of the three groups, the male administrators seem to value Ambition and Initiative. Female Administrators value Self-discipline and Competency more highly than either of the other two groups. All groups value Loyalty and Fairness highly, showing an ethical-moral orientation.

As may be seen, Table 19 illustrates the results of a comparison of operative value scores of the three groups under the heading, "Goals of the Individual". An examination of the differences in the operative value scores of male and female administrators reveals five concepts, Scholarship, Autonomy, Individuality, Job Satisfaction and Education all were rated significantly higher by female administrators. Only Job Satisfaction seems to be highly behaviorally significant. It would appear that women administrators are willing to accept the responsibility of the job as Autonomy and Individuality indicates a commitment of 'self' to the job. For women who chose administrative positions, it appears that job satisfaction is an important factor.

For female teachers and female administrators, Scholarship, Autonomy and Self-Actualization were significantly different, with none being highly operative in terms of behavior. The concepts Professional Prominence, Prestige, Power, Influence and Income are all rated as weak values for all groups. Most highly behaviorally significant are Dignity and Achievement. Male administrators have the highest rating of Dignity, Success and Achievement, while female administrators rated Job Satisfaction, Education, Self-Actualization and Intellectual Growth most highly. Female teachers rated Security the highest of the three groups confirming the notion that females view security as very important.

The rating of operative value scores for "Groups of

TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF OPERATIVE SCORES

Group 1 = Female Administrators N=21
Group 2 = Male Administrators N=73
Group 3 = Female Teachers N=361

PERSONAL GOALS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Concept	Operative Value Score Group 1	2	3	Difference in Operative Value Score Group (1,2)	(1,3)	(2,3)
Scholarship	24	14	9	10*	15*	5
Dignity	57	59	49	2	8	10*
Achievement	57	59	49	2	8	10*
Autonomy	26	11	15	15*	11*	4
Income	5	12	10	7	5	2
Individuality	43	32	34	11*	9	2
Job Satisfaction	52	41	45	11*	7	3
Influence	5	6	7	1	2	1
Security	24	19	32	5	8	13*
Power	10	7	1	3	9	6
Education	38	27	32	11*	6	5
Success	29	33	25	4	4	8
Self-Actualization	40	35	29	5	11*	6
Prestige	10	4	7	6	3	3
Intellectual Growth	43	35	39	8	4	4
Prof. Prominence	10	6	7	4	3	1

* Indicates significant difference > 10 Operative Value Score

People" are displayed in Table 20. Only Parents are behaviorally relevant for male administrators and female teachers. Student Body is behaviorally relevant for male administrators only. Significant behavioral differences occur between the female administrator and the male administrator with respect to Parents, and between male administrators and female teachers compared with female administrators on the concept Student Body. The most outstanding significant difference is the concept Me, which female teachers and male administrators value much more highly than female administrators.

It appears that "Groups of People" are not important in terms of behavioral relevance to the administrative groups. Indicated is a "school-oriented" approach to the concepts Department of Education, Committees, Consultants and Professional Organizations, which are all weak values.

Although the teachers on Prince Edward Island are federated as opposed to unionized, female teachers seem to value Teacher Unions higher than either the female or male administrators. This may indicate a need for more political "clout" within the profession.

The data for "Goals of Educational Organizations" is seen in Table 21 which illustrates that most organizational goals are accepted and internalized by all the groups, as the lowest operative value score was 30. Highly valued by all groups was Equal Educational Opportunity and Student Welfare. Instruction and Optimization of Student Potential

TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF OPERATIVE SCORES

Group 1 =	Female Administrators	N=21
Group 2 =	Male Administrators	N=73
Group 3 =	Female Teachers	N=361

GROUPS OF PEOPLE

Concept	Operative Value Score Group 1	2	3	Difference in Operative Value Score Group (1,2)	(1,3)	(2,3)
School Board	19	21	17	2	2	4
Parents	48	62	55	14*	7	7
Superintendents	10	27	17	17*	7	10*
Committees	5	6	7	1	2	1
Me	10	35	40	25*	30*	5
Prof. Organizations	10	13	12	3	2	1
My Co-workers	38	46	35	8	3	11*
Principals	43	34	38	9	5	4
Student Body	45	58	42	13*	3	16*
Consultants	14	4	9	10*	5	5
Teacher Unions	10	7	18	3	8	11*
Dept. of Ed.	5	13	21	8	16*	8

* Indicates significant difference > 10 Operative Value Score

TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF OPERATIVE SCORES

Group 1 = Female Administrators N=21
Group 2 = Male Administrators N=73
Group 3 = Female Teachers N=361

GOALS OF EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Concept	Operative Value Score Group 1	2	3	Difference in Operative Value Score Group (1,2)	(1,3)	(2,3)
Equal Ed. Opportunity	65	66	62	1	3	4
Program Articulation	30	36	30	6	0	6
Instruction	45	66	64	21*	19*	2
Teacher & Staff Welfare	38	43	52	5	14*	9
Org. Stability	33	37	37	4	4	0
Academic Skills	40	33	45	7	5	12*
Prof. Growth	60	45	45	15*	15*	0
Student Welfare	57	70	67	13*	10*	3
Org. Effectiveness	48	38	34	10*	14*	4
Opt. of Student Potential	48	56	56	8	8	0

* Indicates significant difference > 10 Operative Value Score

were highly valued by male administrators and female teachers with just under 50% of the female administrators rating it as an operative value. Significant deviations were seen between male and female administrators in their rating of Instruction, Professional Growth, Student Welfare and Organizational Effectiveness, with male administrators valuing all but Professional Growth and Organizational Effectiveness more highly.

Teachers valued Student Welfare, Instruction, Teacher and Staff Welfare, traditional goals of educational organizations, more than the female administrators. Female administrators valued Professional Growth more than the female teachers.

The only area in which male administrators differed significantly from female teachers was Academic Skills, which female teachers seem to value more highly, although not to a high degree of behavioral relevance.

The final group of operative concepts was "Ideas About General Topics". As may be seen in Table 22, the largest number of differences occurred between the male and female administrators. Eight concepts, Authority, Accountability, Change, Compromise, Efficiency, Equality, Ethical Behavior and Rationality, all show significant behavioral differences. The male administrators value Authority, Accountability, Equality, Ethical Behavior and Rationality more highly than the female administrators who value Efficiency more highly than their male counterparts. High

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF OPERATIVE SCORES

Group 1 = Female Administrators N=21
Group 2 = Male Administrators N=73
Group 3 = Female Teachers N=361

IDEAS ABOUT GENERAL TOPICS

Concept	Operative Value Score Group 1	2	3	Difference in Operative Value Score Group (1,2)	(1,3)	(2,3)
Authority	14	27	19	13*	5	8
Accountability	38	63	46	25*	8	17*
Change	5	16	16	11*	11*	0
Competition	0	5	6	5	6	1
Compromise	0	23	19	23*	19*	4
Conflict	0	9	2	9	2	7
Consistency	57	55	56	2	1	1
Efficiency	62	45	53	17*	9	8
Equality	38	62	54	24*	16*	8
Ethical Behavior	48	60	58	12*	10*	2
Value System	57	56	46	1	11*	10*
Rationality	33	49	35	16*	2	14*
Risk	5	9	6	4	1	3

* Indicates significant difference > 10 Operative Value Score

behaviorally significant differences may be seen in the values, Accountability, Equality, and Ethical Behavior on the part of the male administrators, while female administrators place significantly more behavioral importance on Efficiency.

A definite ethical-moral orientation is present in the male administrators' evaluation of these concepts. The high rating of the concept Efficiency, seems to indicate a more pragmatic, managerial outlook which tends to reflect a task-oriented approach on the part of female administrators. It is interesting to note that, although a low scored concept operatively, male administrators value Change more highly than female administrators. This may indicate a more conservative approach by the women to an administrative position.

Between female administrators and teachers, five concepts differed significantly. Equality, Ethical Behavior and Value System were behaviorally, significantly different. Female administrators regarded Value System more highly, while teachers viewed Ethical Behavior and Equality more highly. Change and Compromise, which accounted for the two remaining concepts, were valued more highly by the teachers, but were low in behavioral relevance.

Only three concepts accounted for important behavior difference between male administrators and female teachers. Accountability and Value System were seen as operative by a higher percentage of the males than females. As there is ever increased pressure on the administrator for accountability, and as ethics have become an important part of all management theory, this difference is perhaps understandable.

An overall comparison shows all groups agreeing within the ten percent range of operative value scores on 27, or a total of 39%, of all concepts. Concepts highest in behavioral relevance (more than 50%) with consensus by all groups, included Equal Educational Opportunity, Optimization of Student Potential, Loyalty and Consistency. The concepts Aggressiveness, Conformity, Creativity, Influence, Power, Prestige, Professional Prominence, Competition, Risk and Committees were rated very low. The remaining 12 concepts received intermediary scores and indicate that these values only become operative when situationally or environmentally invoked.(see Table 23)

Between group comparisons illustrate that male and female administrators significantly differed on 27 concepts or 39.1%. England (1975) maintained that a 29 percent difference rate indicated "strong evidence" of meaningful differences. Thus it would appear that there are significant differences between the personal value systems of Male and Female Administrators. Investigation by concept shows that male administrators scored significantly higher on the behaviorally relevant concepts Integrity, Student Body and Student Welfare, at a greater than 50% level. Female Administrators scored significantly higher on

TABLE 23

CONCEPTS RATED THE SAME (NON-SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES) BY ALL GROUPS

Operative Value Scores		
> 50	49 - 11	< 10
Equal Ed Opportunity	Income	Agressiveness
Opt. of Student	Success	Conformity
Potential	Intellectual Growth	Creativity
Loyalty	Program Articulation	Influence
Consistency	Org. Stability	Power
	School Board	Prestige
	Prof. Organizations	Prof. Prominence
	Principals	Committees
	Ability	Competition
	Intelligence	Conflict
	Compassion	Risk
	Co-operation	

Self-discipline and Job Satisfaction. Padfield (1979) hypothesized and confirmed that the greatest potential for conflict and disagreement behaviorally occurs in other significant areas when one group is over 50 in operative value score and one group is under 50, with a ten percent difference.

In this category female administrators scored significantly higher at greater that 50 in Professional Growth, Efficiency and Job Satisfaction. Male administrators scored significantly higher in this category on Parents, Student Body, Instruction, Accountability, Equality and Ethical Behavior. Table 24 indicates the relevant and non-relevant behavioral differences between these groups. It is interesting to note that only one concept, Consultants, is considered non-significant and the majority could be situationally or environmentally induced depending on the organizational climate. Areas of potential conflict between male and female administrators are therefore seen in the above nine listed areas.

It should also be noted that the highest differences occurred in the following values: Self-discipline (24), Me (25), Instruction (21), Compromise (25) and Accountability (25).

The female administrators and female teachers differed significantly on 18 concepts for a total of 26.1%. Significant differences are shown in Table 25, at the appropriate levels of behavioral significance. The 26.1%

TABLE 24

CONCEPTS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OPERATIVE VALUE SCORES MALE AND FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS

Operative Value Scores		
> 50	49 - 11	< 10
Integrity	Ambition	Consultants
Self-discipline	Initiative	
Competency	Scholarship	
Parents*(MA)	Autonomy	
Student Body*(MA)	Individuality	
Instruction*(MA)	Job Satisfaction*(FA)	
Prof. Growth*(FA)	Education	
Student Welfare	Superintendents	
Accountability*(MA)	Me	
Efficiency*(FA)	Org. Effectiveness	
Equality*(MA)	Authority	
Ethical Behavior*(MA)	Change	
	Compromise	
	Rationality	

* Indicates one group >50, one group < 50.
() Indicates group with highest Operative Value Score.
MA = Male Administrator
FA = Female Administrator

TABLE 25

CONCEPTS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OPERATIVE VALUE SCORES
FEMALE TEACHERS AND FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS

Operative Value Scores		
> 50	49 - 11	< 10
Integrity	Tolerance	
Fairness	Objectivity	
Self-Discipline	Scholarship	
Competency*(FA)	Autonomy	
Instruction*(FT)	Self-Actualization	
Prof. Growth*(FA)	Me	
Equality*(FT)	Dept. of Education	
Ethical Behavior*(FT)	Teacher & Staff Welfare	
	Change	
	Compromise	

* Indicates one group >50, one group < 50.
() Indicates group with highest Operative Value Score.
FT = Female Teacher
FA = Female Administrator

difference indicates that there appear to be some meaningful differences in the operative value scores and the value systems of female administrators and teachers who took part in the study. Female administrators again illustrate that Competency and Professional Growth were extremely important concepts, with the teachers rating Instruction, Equality and Ethical Behavior as highly behaviorally relevant. The highest degree of differences occurred in the concepts Self-discipline (19), Competency (25), Me (30) and Instruction (19), indicating areas of potential conflict between female teachers and female administrators.

The final comparison of operative scores (see Table 26) was between the male administrators and the female teachers. Fifteen concepts, or 20.2% proved significantly different in the operative value scores.

As may be seen Trust, Dignity, Achievement, Student Body, Accountability and Value System are all highly significantly different in behavioral relevance. Dignity, Student Body, Accountability and Value System have operative value scores greater than 50 for males and less than 50 for the teachers. This difference may be considered as highly significant. No concepts were different at less than 10 and the majority of concepts could be situationally and/or environmentally induced.

Overall, there appears to be less difference in the personal value systems of male administrators and female teachers than either female and male administrators, or

TABLE 26

CONCEPTS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN OPERATIVE VALUE SCORES
MALE ADMINISTRATORS AND FEMALE TEACHERS

Operative Value Scores		
> 50	49 - 11	< 10
Trust	Ambition	
Dignity*(MA)	Initiative	
Achievement	Decisiveness	
Student Body*(MA)	Security	
Accountability*(MA)	Superintendents	
Value System*(MA)	My Co-Workers	
	Teacher Unions	
	Academic Skills	
	Rationality	

* Indicates one group >50, one group < 50.
() Indicates group with highest Operative Value Score.
FT = Female Teacher
MA = Male Administrator

female administrators and female teachers. The potential for conflict would therefore be seen as greatest between female administrators and female teachers and female and male administrators.

F. Value Hierarchies

Similarities and differences in the value hierarchies of the three groups were investigated by utilizing a rank ordering of the concepts by their Behavioral Relevance Scores for this investigation. The following list rank orders the concepts 1-69 by the BRS and provides a value hierarchy for each group.

Female Administrators

The following list provides the Value Hierarchy for Female Administrators.

Rank	Concept (Behavioral Relevance Score)
1	Trust (90)
2	Self-discipline (88)
3	Competency (87)
4	Loyalty (86)
5	Fairness (84)
6	Job Satisfaction (82)
7	Integrity (81)
8	Co-operation (80)
9	Student Welfare (79)
10	Professional Growth (77)
11.5	Efficiency, Compassion (75)
14	Equal Educational Opportunity, Parents, Student Body (73)
16.5	Ethical Behavior, Instruction (72)
19	Value System, Achievement, Dignity (71)
21.5	My Co-workers, Accountability (70)
23	Optimization of Student Potential (69)
24	Consistency
25	Organizational Effectiveness (67)
26	Intellectual Growth (65)

27.5	Principals, Ambition (64)
29.5	Academic Skills, Self-Actualization (63)
31	Initiative (61)
32	Teacher and Staff Welfare (60)
33	Equality (58)
34.5	Ability, Objectivity (57)
36	Individuality (56)
37.5	Education, Organizational Stability (55)
39.5	Program Articulation, Decisiveness (53)
41.5	Success, Tolerance (48)
43	Rationality (47)
44	Security (43)
45	Intelligence (40)
46.5	Professional Organizations, Scholarship (34)
48	School Board (33)
49	Authority (32)
50	Autonomy (31)
51	Teacher Unions (30)
52.5	Creativity, Me (29)
54	Department of Education (28)
55.5	Superintendents, Consultants (27)
57	Change (25)
58	Compromise (23)
59	Committees (21)
60	Power (17)
61.5	Professional Prominence, Conformity, Risk, Competition (13)
67	Conflict (12)
68	Income (10)
69	Aggressiveness (8)

In terms of their value hierarchy, Female Administrators clearly value Trust, Self-discipline, Competency and Loyalty as the most important concepts, indicating they would be the most influential in terms of behavior. The opposite end of the hierarchy shows Income and Aggressiveness as having little influence on behavior.

Male Administrators

The following presents the value hierarchy for the Male Administrators in the study.

Rank	Concept (Behavioral Relevance Score)
1	Fairness (88)
2	Student Welfare (86)
3	Instruction (85)
5	Trust, Parents, Equal Educational Opportunity (83)
7	Loyalty (82)
8	Student Body (79)
9.5	Accountability, Integrity (78)
11	Ethical Behavior (77)
12	Job Satisfaction (76)
13.5	Competency, My Co-workers (75)
15.5	Dignity, Equality (73)
17.5	Consistency Optimization of Student Potential (72)
19	Value System (71)
20.5	Self-discipline, Initiative (69)
22	Efficiency (68)
23.5	Ambition, Rationality (66)
25.5	Co-operation, Success (64)
27	Professional Growth (63)
28	Compassion (61)
29	Me (60)
30	Achievement (59)
32	Objectivity, Organizational Effectiveness, Self-Actualization (57)
34.5	Teacher and Staff Welfare, Decisiveness (56)
36.5	Organizational Stability, Intellectual Growth (54)
38	Program Articulation (53)
39	Ability (52)
40	Principals (51)
41.5	Education, Academic Skills (49)
43	Tolerance (48)
44	Individuality (47)
45	Superintendents (45)
46	Authority (41)
47.5	School Board, Security (39)
49	Compromise (37)
50	Intelligence (34)
51.5	Change, Scholarship (31)
53	Creativity (29)
54.5	Autonomy, Professional Organizations (28)
56	Consultants (27)
57.5	Income, Influence (25)
59	Department of Education (24)
60.5	Committees, Risk (21)

62	Teacher Unions (18)
63.5	Prestige, Competition (17)
65.5	Aggressiveness, Conflict (16)
67	Professional Prominence (15)
68	Power (12)
69	Conformity (11)

As may been seen by the Male Administrators' Value Hierarchy, they place great behavioral importance on the concepts Fairness, Student Welfare and Instruction. These concepts would appear to be the ones which the male administrator would express in terms of overt behavior. Having seemingly little importance on behavior would be Aggressiveness and Power.

Female Teachers

The following is a list of concepts of value of the Female Teacher, rank ordered by Behavioral Relevance Score and denoting the Value Hierarchy of this group.

Rank	Concept (Behavioral Relevance Score)
1	Trust (90)
2	Fairness (88)
3	Loyalty (83)
4	Student Welfare (82)
5	Instruction (81)
6	Integrity (80)
7.5	Parents, Equal Educational Opportunity (77)
9	Self-discipline (76)
10.5	Efficiency, Job Satisfaction (75)
13.5	Optimization of Student Potential, Consistency, Ethical Behavior, Teacher and Staff Welfare (72)
16	Co-operation (70)
17	Equality (69)
19.5	Dignity, Competency, Compassion, Achievement (65)
22	Student Body (64)
25.5	Professional Growth, Academic Skills Value System, My Co-workers, Me, Accountability (62)
29	Intellectual Growth (60)
30.5	Principals, Security (57)

32	Tolerance (56)
33.5	Ambition, Organizational Stability (55)
35	Individuality (54)
36.5	Education, Initiative (53)
38.5	Ability, Organizational Effectiveness (52)
40	Rationality (51)
41	Self-Actualization (50)
42	Success (48)
43	Intelligence (47)
44	Program Articulation (45)
45	Decisiveness (43)
46	Objectivity (42)
47	Department of Education (38)
48	Compromise (37)
49	Authority (36)
50	Professional Organizations (34)
51	Superintendents (33)
52.5	School Board, Teacher Unions (32)
54	Change (30)
55	Autonomy (29)
56	Income (26)
57	Creativity (24)
58	Scholarship (22)
59	Consultants (21)
60	Committees (20)
61	Risk (19)
62	Professional Prominence (18)
63	Competition (17)
65	Prestige, Influence, Conflict (16)
67	Conformity (15)
68	Aggressiveness (13)
69	Power (8)

As may be seen by the Female Teachers' hierarchy, they appear to value the concepts Trust, Fairness and Loyalty. These concepts would have the potential to be expressed in overt behavior. It appears that they value Aggressiveness and Power the least and it would appear that these concepts would have very little, if any, importance in terms of overt behavior.

In order to further examine the hierarchies of Female Administrators, Male Administrators and Female Teachers, the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) was utilized to determine the degree of relationship between the value hierarchies of the three groups.

In Table 27 the rank-order correlation coefficient for each group is given and the variables are broken down into the five categories listed in the questionnaire. The final figure is the overall mean rank-order coefficient for the three groups. It should be noted that a perfect positive correlation is +1.00, while a perfect negative correlation is -1.00.

As may be seen in the overall comparison of the mean correlation coefficient, the value hierarchies of the three groups are positively and highly correlated, .901 to .915. In order to further compare the similarities in the value hierarchies, the concepts were broken down into the five categories utilized in the questionnaire. Each group was analyzed separately. Within the five areas, the scores ranged from .729 to .925 for male and female administrators, .713 to .929 for female administrators and teachers, and .811 to .915 for male administrators and female teachers. It is interesting to note that the value hierarchies of female teachers and male administrators are more highly correlated in terms of range spread than the female and male administrators. Female administrators and teachers have the least highly correlated hierarchies in terms of range. The female administrators and teachers appear to have the highest correlation, followed by the male administrators and female teachers and lastly the male and female administrators.

TABLE 27

SPEARMAN RANK-ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

		Groups	
	MA/FA	FA/FT	MA/FT
Ideas Associated With People	0.925	0.908	0.895
Personal Goals Of Individuals	0.904	0.885	0.871
Groups of People	0.729	0.788	0.863
Goals of Educational Organizations	0.842	0.713	0.811
Ideas About General Topics	0.861	0.929	0.859
Overall	0.901	0.922	0.915

MA = Male Administrators
FA = Female Administrators
FT = Female Teachers

Comparisons show that "Ideas Associated with People" appears to be the most highly correlated area in the breakdown of concepts, while "Goals of the Educational Organization" appears to be the least correlated. Remembering that in terms of the value profiles, this area appeared as the most similar, one may assume that in terms of rank-ordering the concepts, the three groups would vary the least. However, this not being the case, it would appear to indicate that the importance of these concepts would not be lessened when taking into consideration their extremely high behavioral relevance scores, although it might cause some conflict in terms of setting priorities.

Overall the value hierarchies of the three groups are still positively and highly correlated.

G. Relative Variability of the Value Systems

England (1975) introduced an Average Deviation Score (AD Score) to compare the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the value systems of groups. The Average Deviation Score, as stated by England (1975):

> can vary from zero (if 100 percent of the responses are of one value) to 1.65 (if the responses split were 34 percent, 0 percent, 33 percent, 33 percent for the value types respectively.) (p.42)

The lower the AD Score, the more homogeneous the groups' view of the concept. Therefore, the AD Score is viewed as giving an indication of group consensus when the score is low, and group disagreement when the score is high, in response to a concept.

As can be seen in Table 28, the group which appears to have the lowest mean AD Score and therefore the most homogeneous value system, is the female administrators, followed by the male administrators and the female teachers. It is interesting to note that female administrators scored lowest in the AD Score on 42 of 69 concepts when compared with both the male administrators and the female teachers. Appendix H contains the Average Deviation Scores for all three groups.

The lowest AD Score for the female administrators was given to the concept Aggressiveness. It appears that female administrators have reached consensus on this concept having given little importance to it. The highest deviation occurred in the concept Decisiveness and Rationality indicating low consensus in the group's viewing of these concepts. The mixed value orientation of these concepts seems to confirm this.

For male administrators, Conformity had the lowest AD Score. Strong agreement seems to be present in the lack of importance as this value was scored 'weak' in value type. The highest AD Score was assigned to the concept Ability, showing a lack of consensus as to the importance of Ability in the value system.

Female teachers demonstrated consensus in their rating of Power as a weak value and lack of consensus in their rating of Ability which was seen as a mixed value type for this group.

TABLE 28

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE DEVIATION SCORES (AD SCORES) OF THREE GROUPS

AD Score	FA	MA	FT
Mean ADS	0.82	0.89	0.95
Lowest ADS	0.24	0.37	0.25
Highest ADS	1.58	1.55	1.59

	FA/MA	FT/FA	MA/FT
# of Concepts with lower ADS	42 (FA)	42 (FA)	36 (MA)

MA = Male Administrators
FA = Female Administrators
FT = Female Teachers

Each of the concepts rated lower in AD Score is most important as homogeneous operative values can be considered not only highly relevant behaviorally, but also, according to Padfield (1979) they "have the power of high group consensus" (p.130), indicating potential for action in these areas.

To determine if there were statistically significant differences in the homogeneity of group response, Analysis of Variance was computed for the three groups. (see Appendix I) The results are presented in Table 29. Level of significant difference was set at .10 level or better. Of 69 concepts, 18 proved significantly different between male administrators and female teachers. One concept, Self-discipline, was significantly different between the male and female administrators, while Competency and Me were significantly different between the female administrators and female teachers.

A lack of significant differences concerning the female administrators and the other two groups may be due to the small N (21). Although Analysis of Variance is used extensively with groups with very small N's, the possibility of differences occurring strictly by chance is much higher in groups with small N's. It may be assumed for the purpose of this particular study that the differences that occurred are indeed significant in the concepts seen in Table 29.

TABLE 29

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Concept	F - Probability
Ambition	.05
Trust	.05
Initiative	.005
Decisiveness	.05
Objectivity	.01
Self-Discipline(MA/FA)	.05
Competency(FA/FT)	.005
(MA/FT)	.005
Influence	.1
Security	.001
Success	.005
Teacher Unions	.01
Department of Education	.01
Teacher & Staff Welfare	.001
Academic Skills	.05
Accountability	.005
Rationality	.01
Superintendents	.01
My Co-workers	.01
Student Body	.01
Me(FA/FT)	.1

* Groups not indicated otherwise, illustrate significant differences between male administrators and female teachers only. All differences were determined by Scheffe's Test (significant at the .1 level).

H. Summary

Investigation of the personal value systems of the three groups in the study, female administrators, male administrators and female teachers, appears to indicate that there are interesting similarities and significant differences in the personal value systems of all groups.

Although value orientations of all three groups appear to be similar, with the majority of responses showing an ethical-moral orientation, further investigation into the value profiles, value hierarchies and scores of homo- and heterogeneity, provided interesting similarities and significant differences in all these areas.

Comparisons of the value profiles of the three groups, conducted by value-type and operative value scores, found significant differences in the behavioral relevance for 27 concepts between male and female administrators, 18 concepts between female administrators and teachers, and 15 concepts between male administrators and the female teachers in the study.

The value hierarchies of all three groups were highly and positively correlated by use of the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient, however interesting differences occurred when the concepts were broken down into the five areas investigated within the PVQ. Where previously the hierarchies were highly correlated, .90-.92, this correlation dropped to .71-.84 for the sub-topic "Goals of Educational Organizations".

Average deviation scores indicated a higher degree of homogeneity for female administrators than for male administrators or female teachers. F-tests of significance indicated that on 18 concepts, male administrators differed significantly with female teachers, while female administrators differed significantly on two concepts with female teachers and one concept with male administrators.

It appears that in terms of differences in the homogeneity of concept response, female teachers and male administrators differ more than female administrators when compared to either of the other two groups. Therefore it might be stated that male administrators and female teachers differ more and female administrators appear to fall somewhere in between the groups in their rating of the concepts.

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter of the study presents (1) a summary of the investigation, (2) the findings and conclusions reached, (3) implications drawn from the study and (4) recommendations for further research.

A. Summary of the Investigation

The research was conducted to investigate the similarities and differences in the personal value systems of the three groups previously outlined to ascertain if personal values could be considered as a variable in women who choose administrative careers in education.

In order to do this, library research was conducted in the investigation of concepts of value, values and culture, and the impact of socialization processes on values and value systems. A paucity of research relating to men and women and the values they hold within an educational context was noted. Attention was drawn to the importance of studying value systems in order to further the understanding of group behavior in the organization. The scarcity of women in administrative positions in education was also noted.

The instrument chosen, the Personal Values Questionnaire, was adapted from Padfield (1979) and Sjogren (1969) for use in the study. A panel of ten judges was selected and their input used to modify the instrument for use with in-school and school-related personnel.

The sample was drawn from the total population of female and male administrators and female teachers on Prince Edward Island comprising 907 individuals. Each subject received a copy of the questionnaire, a letter explaining the purpose of the study and a return envelope. Responses received totalled 73.6% with 63.6% of the total returns being usable.

Each subject's questionnaire was analyzed in terms of primary value orientation. The concepts were designated operative, intended, adopted or weak and group profiles were calculated from the individual responses. Behavioral Relevance Scores and Average Deviation Scores were calculated for all three groups and value hierarchies constructed using the Behavioral Relevance Score. The relative variability of the value systems was examined using the Average Deviation Score and F-tests of statistical significance were performed to provide an overall picture of the homogeneity and heterogeneity of response by the groups.

B. Findings and Conclusions

Findings

The first research question was designed to investigate the similarities and/or differences in the value profiles of the three groups in the study. All groups proved to be relatively similar in their value orientations. Overall the primary value orientation of the groups was ethical-moral with fewer individuals as pragmatic. The female administrators were more pragmatic than either of the other groups.

In their value profiles, by group value type, 34.8% of the concepts were classified differently by male and female administrators, although only 9 or 13% proved behaviorally significant at greater than 50 in BRS.

Female administrators and teachers classified 23 concepts, or 33.3% differently with 6 or 8.6% significantly different in BRS. Female teachers and male administrators classified 17, or 24.6% differently in terms of value type with 11.5% greater than 50 in BRS.

In terms of value typing, there did not appear to be many significant differences in the way the three groups value-typed the concepts. However, as was found in the comparison of the value profiles, significant differences were present when the concepts were compared by operative value scores.

Between group comparisons of the operative value scores revealed that male and female administrators differed significantly on 27 concepts. This accounted for 39.1% of the total number of concepts. England (1975) maintained that a 29% difference provided strong evidence of meaningful differences. Female administrators and teachers differed significantly on 18 concepts, accounting for 26.1% of the total concepts. It appeared that there were meaningful differences between these two groups.

Male administrators and female teachers differed significantly on 15 or 20.2% of the concepts when compared using the operative value scores. Although fewer in number than the other between-group comparisons found, it appeared that male administrators and female teachers differed significantly in a number of concepts worthy of note.

The male and female administrators differed in more concepts than either of the other two between group comparisons. In terms of both the operative value scores and the value type comparison, the male and female administrators differed more than the other groups.

The second research question was posed on the similarities in the value system hierarchies of the three groups in the study. Using Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient, it was found that the value hierarchies of the three groups were significantly and positively correlated, ranging from .901 for male and female administrators to .922 for female administrators and teachers and .915 for male administrators and female teachers.

Interesting differences occurred when the concepts were broken down into the five concept groupings from the questionnaire with ranges from .713 to .929. Although not as highly and positively correlated as the overall correlations, the hierarchical rank-ordering of the groupings was still positively, if not as highly, correlated.

The third, and last research question was designed to examine the "relative variability" of the values of the three groups in the study. Average deviation scores showed the female administrators as having the most homogeneous value system, with female teachers having the least, or most heterogeneous value system. Female administrators' average deviation scores were consistently the lowest of the three groups. The female administrators in between-group comparisons had 42 concepts or 60.9% rated lower than both the other groups. Male administrators had 36 or 52.1% concepts rated lower than the female teachers.

F-tests of significance were calculated between groups for 69 concepts. Eighteen concepts proved significantly different between the male administrators and female teachers. Only two concepts showed significant differences between the female administrators and female teachers and one between the two administrative groups.

Limitations of the Study

Having completed the study, the following were considered to be limitations of the study.

1. A Step-wise Multiple Discriminant Analysis was not performed on the groups to investigate the relationship between responses to the identified personal values contained in the questionnaire and group membership because Tatsuoka (1970) indicated that in order to perform this statistical test, the smallest group should not be smaller than the least number of variables used. As the smallest N (21) was less than one-third the

number of variables, the sub-problem relating to this area was not included and the research question discarded.

2. Women teachers who were identified as having held administrative positions and who no longer held administrative positions for various reasons, were not included in the administrative group because the majority of these subjects indicated that they did not like their administrative positions, and were thus classified within the "teacher" category.
3. Interview schedules were not conducted as it would have necessitated a return trip to Prince Edward Island and at the time of the study, this proved financially impossible.

Conclusions

From the findings it was concluded that the concepts relating to value systems of male and female administrators and female teachers show significant differences when tested within certain areas and are extremely similar when tested in other areas.

It would appear that behaviorally, there are areas of potential conflict amongst the groups. Worthy of note are the concepts dealing with Goals of Educational Organizations. Behaviorally significant differences in operative value scores occurred in this area and the low rank-order coefficient seems to indicate that difficulty could potentially arise in the setting of priorities for the groups. Areas of similarity are also worthy of note such as the ethical-moral orientation of all the groups and their humanistic approach to values concerning students and teacher and staff welfare. The overall high mean rank-order correlation coefficient of the value hierarchies indicated a strong degree of similarity in the value hierarchies of all groups, while Average Deviation Scores showed female administrators as having the most homogeneous value systems. Scheffe's tests of significant differences indicated that male administrators and female teachers differed on more concepts than either group compared to the female administrators. As Padfield (1979) stated:

> Both similarities and differences must be considered, if any meaningful description of the value systems of the groups is to be prepared. (p.165)

In terms of the differences between groups, and whether personal value systems can be considered as a variable in women who choose administrative careers in education, this question appeared to be confirmed by the results of this study. There were significant differences in the value systems of all the groups. However whether these differences exist as a result of the position, or whether they were already possessed before these women became administrators, at this point, remains a question for further research. It may be assumed from this study that there are differences in the personal value systems of male and female administrators and female teachers on Prince Edward Island and that personal value systems vary significantly in women who chose administrative careers in education. Whether these values were environmentally or socioculturally induced, is a question for further research.

C. Implications

The investigation into the value systems of female administrators suggests some interesting implications.

As the study of values and value systems can provide insight into the behavior of individuals and groups within an organizational framework for the researcher, the potential for conflict in differing value patterns amongst individuals and groups provides serious implications for the functioning of the organization. For the groups comprising the educational organization in this study, there appears to be a strong indication of potential conflict in the area of priority-setting in terms of educational goals. As all groups rated the concepts related to "Goals of Educational Organizations" extremely high, and rank-ordered the concepts within this area the least consistently, there appears to be a high degree of potential for conflict. This potential for conflict would appear to be greatest between female and male administrators where the most behaviorally relevant differences occurred.

For women who choose administrative careers in education on Prince Edward Island it seems significant that the majority of female administrators are older, more pragmatic, less highly educated, hold vice-principalships in elementary schools and teach a much greater percentage of the time than their male counterparts. They also rated themselves the lowest, on the concept Me and significant differences were evident in comparisons with the other groups. This may indicate a lack of self-esteem on their part. This appears understandable when considering the fact that they are truly neither full-time teachers nor full-time administrators. As a result of this situation, it is not surprising that they do not differ significantly with either of the other two groups on scores homogeneity and heterogeneity of concepts. If it were possible to compare the three groups along a line on a continuum, it might be suggested that the value systems of female administrators are situated somewhere between those of the male administrator and female teacher. Also further investigation of the demographic variables which were only used descriptively in this study might possibly bring to light other areas and potentially significant differences to assist in the explanation of these phenomenon.

With this in mind, it would be most difficult at this point in time to state whether value systems could be considered as a criterion for selecting females for administrative careers in education. Further investigation would be necessary to clarify this issue. Since this study found significant differences in the value systems in comparison of all groups, one might be led to question the source of these values and the impact they have in terms of the position chosen. Conversely, the impact of the individual and/or group values on position must necessarily also be investigated. It would therefore follow that further investigation of this area is essential in order to obtain a more complete understanding of the value systems of women in administration, and those women who who have chosen a career in what has become a male-dominated field in education.

D. Recommendations for Further Research

1. This study dealt specifically with one population, further studies utilizing total populations in other provinces should be considered.
2. Utilization of demographic variables could determine significant differences in areas not already examined, such as age, education, environment and position.
3. An ethnographic study could be considered where numbers of women in administrative positions are very small and observations are possible, to determine observed differences in behavior relating to personal values and value systems.
4. As the majority of female administrators in this study were not singularly administrators only, this position must be more clearly defined and studies conducted where there is comparable interaction between positions.
5. A study could be conducted which utilizes a comparison of the value systems of male teachers with the groups

already investigated.

References

Abbott, M. Values and value-perception in superintendent-school board relationships. Administrators Notebook, 1960, 4, 9.

Allport, G. and Vernon, P. A test for personal values. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1931, 26, 231-48.

Allport, G., Vernon, P., and Lindzey, G. Study of values: Manual of directions. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Asper, L. Factors affecting the entry of women into administrative positions of the Manitoba school system. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Manitoba, 1974.

Baier, K. What is value? An analysis of the concept. In K.Baier and N.Rescher (Eds.), Values and the future. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Bandura, A., and Walters, R. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Barter, A. Status of women in school administration. Education Digest, 1959, 25, 72-75.

Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Benedict, R. Patterns of culture. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934.

Bennis, W.G. The unconscious conspircy: Why leaders can't lead. New York: Amacon, 1976.

Bernard, J. Academic women. University Park: Penn State University Press, 1964.

Borg, W., and Gall, M. Educational research: An introduction. (2nd ed.), New York: Longman, 1971.

Broverman, I., Broverman, D,. Clarkson, F. Rosenkrantz, P. and Vogel, S. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Bryans, D. Education and acculturation: The school in a mulicultural setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Alberta, 1971.

Campbell, R., Bridges, E. and Nystrand, O. Introduction to educational administration. (5th ed.) Toronto: Allyn and Bacon, 1977.

Cartwright, L. Personality differences in male and female medical students. Psychiatry in Medicine, 1972, 3, 213-218.

Crosby, J. An exploratory study of women superintendents. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1973) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 3742A (University Microfilms No.73-31,074.)

Dale, C. Women are still missing persons in administrative and supervisory jobs. Educational Leadership, 1973, 31, 123-127.

Deaux, K. The behavior of women and men. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Company, 1976.

England, G.W. The manager and his values: An interpersonal perspective from the United States, Japan, Korea, India and Australia. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1975.

Epstein, C. Women's place. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Fisher, S. Relationships in attitudes, opinions and values among family members. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948.

Flowers, V., Hughes, C., Meyers, S.M. and Meyers, S.S. Managerial values for working. New York: Amacon, 1975.

Glass, G. and Stanley, J. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Clifs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Hoy, W. and Miskel, C. Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. New York: Random House, 1978.

Jacob, P. and Flink, J. Values and their function in decision making. The American Behavioral Scientist, May 1962.

Kerlinger, F. Foundations of behavioral research. (2nd ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Klein, V. The stereotype of femininity. Journal of Social Issues, 1950, 6, 3-12.

Kluckhohn, C. Value and value orientation in the theory of action. In T.Parsons and E.Shils (Eds.), Toward a General Theory of Action. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Lambert, R.D. Sex-role imagery in children: Social origins of mind. Studies of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1971.

Lewis, E. Developing women's potential. Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1968.

Lunneborg, P. Stereotypic aspect in masculinity-femininity. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1970, 34, 113-118.

Lupini, D. A study of the relation of differential values to social and administrative interactions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1965.

Lusk, E. and Oliver, B. American Manager's Personal Value System Revisited. Academy of Management Journal. 1972, 9, 549-554.

Maccoby, E., and Jacklin, C. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Mead, M. Sex and temperament in three primitive societies. New York: William Morrow and Company Inc., 1935.

McIntosh, J. Women on the way up: A comparison of women elementary teachers who have not applied for promotion. Unpublished research paper, O.I.S.E., 1973.

Memorandum of Agreement. Charlottetown: Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation, 1979.

Nixon, J. The mechanics of questionnaire construction. Journal of Educational Research, 1954, 47, 481-482.

Nixon, M. Women administrators and women teachers: A comparative study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1973.

Nixon, M., and Gue, L. Women administrators and women teachers: A comparative study. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1975, 20 (3), 196-206.

Nixon, M., and Hrynyk, P. Women in school administration: A study of the deployment of women in positions of administrative responsibility in Alberta Schools. Edmonton: Alberta Teachers' Association, 1973.

Osgood, E., Suci, G. and Tannenbaum, P. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Padfield, C. A comparison of the value systems of academic administrators and physical educators in seven western Canadian universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Southern California, 1979.

Parsons, T., Shils, E., Allport, G., Kluckhohn, C., Murray, H., Sears, R., Sheldon, R., Stouffer, S. and Tolman, E. Some fundamental categories of the theory of action: A general statement. In T.Parsons and E.Shils (Eds.), Toward a General Theory of Action. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Parsons, T., Shils, E., Allport, G. and Olds, J. Values, motives and systems of action. In T.Parsons and E.Shils (Eds.), Toward a General Theory of Action. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Richardson-Walum, L. The dynamics of sex and gender: A sociological perspective. Chicago: Rand McNally College, 1977.

Robillard, E. Women administrators in Alberta community colleges. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1979.

Robinson, A., and Agism, P. Making surveys more reliable. Journal of Marketing, 1951, 60, 415-424.

Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes and values: A theory of organizational change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I. and Broverman, D. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concept of college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.

Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada: Report of the Royal Commssion on the Status of Women in Canada. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1970.

Sargent, S., and Williamson, R. Social psychology. (3rd ed.), New York: Ronald Press Company, 1966.

Scheibe, K. Beliefs and values. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Sears, R. Development of gender role. In F.A.Beach (Ed.), Sex and behavior. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Shack, S. Women in Canadian education. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing Limited, 1975.

Sjogren, D. Development of an instrument for assessing the personal values of educational administrators. A.T.W. Board of Research Project 8-H-016, Colorado State University, 1969.

Skolnick, A. The intimate environment: Exploring marriage and the family. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973.

Spence, J., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. The personal attributes questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 43.

Stephenson, M. Women in Canada. Toronto: New Press, 1973.

Stokes, S. The career patterns of women elementary school principals. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1974.

Tatsuoka,M. Discriminant Analysis: The Study of Group Differences. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.

Taylor, C. and Barron, F. A look ahead. In C.Taylor and F.Barron (Eds.), Scientific creativity: Its recognition and development. New York: Wiley, 1963.

Thornton, M. Values and the perception of leader behavior. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1967.

Toews, L. Self-hatred in college women: Sex-role stereotypes and same sex-affilation. Unpublished doctoral disseration, University of Alberta, 1973.

Tosi, H., and Carroll, S. Management: Contingencies, structures and process. Chicago: St. Clair Press, 1976.

Traxler, A., and Vecchione, N. Scores of seniors in six secondary schools on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey study of values. Education Record Bulletin. 1959, 74, 75-89.

von Fange, E. Implications for school administrators of the personality structure of educational personnel. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961.

Walberg, H. Physics, femininity, and creativity. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 47-54.

Williams, J. Psychology of women: Behavior in a biosocial context. New York: W.W.Norton and Co. Inc., 1977.

Williams, R. American society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.

Wolman, C. and Frank, H. The solo woman in a professional peer group. Working paper No.136, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1972.

APPENDIX A

ENGLAND AND SJOGREN - CORRESPONDENCE

Department of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2G5

November 7, 1979

Dr. G. W. England,
Professor of Psychology and Industrial Relations,
Industrial Relations Centre,
537, Business Administration,
The Universityof Minnesota,
271, 19th Avenue South,
Minneapolis, Minnesota. 55455

Dear Dr. England,

I am presently enrolled in the Master of Education programme at the University of Alberta, working towards a degree in Educational Administration, under the supervision of Dr. C. Bumbarger.

Through the work of Dr. Clive Padfield, a professor in Movement Education here in the university, I have become increasingly interested in your work. I am most interested in investigating for my thesis, the personal value systems of in-school administrators and teachers in my home province of Prince Edward Island. In order to do this, I would like to use the PVQ; however, it will be necessary to modify the original instrument. I am therefore writing to ask for your permission to substitute alternative and/or equivalent concepts for use in my proposed study, as there are several concepts which would have little or no meaning for in-school administrators and teachers.

If you are willing to allow me to make the alterations, I would be most interested in keeping you informed regarding both changes made, and also the progress and findings of the study.

I am,
Yours truly,

(Ms) Ruth C. Lambert

RCL/rs

The University of Oklahoma at Norman
Center for Economic and Management Research
College of Business Administration

November 13, 1979

Ms. Ruth C. Lambert
Department of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2G5

Dear Ms. Lambert:

Your letter requesting permission to use the PVQ was forwarded to me from the Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.

I am happy to give you permission to use the PVQ and have enclosed a form which has been used by educational administrators, and which I believe might be most helpful to you.

Since I am no longer at the University of Minnesota, should you wish to contact me in future, please address all correspondence to the Center for Economic and Management Research, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

George W. England
Director

Enclosure

Department of Education
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

January 21, 1980

Ms. Ruth Lambert
Department of Educational Administration
Education North, 7th Floor
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada

Dear Ms. Lambert:

This letter conveys permission to use and/or revise the Personal Values Questionniare for education administrators.

Sincerely,

Douglas Sjogren
Professor

DS/111

APPENDIX B

CONCEPT EVALUATION

PERSONAL VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

The following concepts have been listed from a combination of concepts in two questionniare developed in order to study the personal value systems of individuals within an organizational context. These questionnaires were developed by Dr. Clive Padfield of the University of Alberta and the Human Factors Research Laboratory, Colorado State University from an original study by Dr. G. W. England, at the University of Minnesota, presently at the University of Oklahoma.

The original study designed by Dr. England for use with managers in industry, has been revised to suit an educational setting by Dr. Padfield, who used his questionnaire with academic administrators and physical educators in a university setting. The Colorado State questionnaire was designed to be used with educational administrators.

This revision is to ascertain concepts relevant to both in-school administrators AND teachers. It would be appreciated if you would indicate on the attached sheets:

Which concepts you would accept as meaningful and/or suitable for use in a study with in-school administrators and teachers.

Which concpets you feel are not suitably worded, but for which an equivalent concept may be substituted.

Which concepts are not suitable and for which there appears to be no substitution.

Any concept not listed and which, in your opinion, should be included in a study of an in-school population.

Permission has been obtained from Dr. England to make the revisions necessary for this study.

Thank you for your time and effort.

IDEAS ASSOCIATED WITH PEOPLE

DECISIVENESS
INITIATIVE
OBJECTIVITY
SELF-DISCIPLINE
FAIRNESS
COOPERATION
ABILITY
FLEXIBILITY
EMOTIONAL STABILITY
COMPETENCY
INTEGRITY
AMBITION
INTELLIGENCE
TRUST
AGGRESSIVENESS
LOYALTY
PREJUDICE
COMPASSION
SKILL
TOLERANCE
CONFORMITY
CREATIVITY
HONOR

PERSONAL GOALS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

SCHOLARSHIP
DIGNITY
ACHIEVEMENT
AUTONOMY
MONEY
INDIVIDUALITY
JOB SATISFACTION
INFLUENCE
EDUCATION
SUCCESS
SELF-ACTUALIZATION
PRESTIGE
POWER
NEW KNOWLEDGE
PROFESSIONAL PROMINENCE
INTELLECTUAL GROWTH
INCOME
LEISURE

GROUPS OF PEOPLE

ADMINSTRATORS
COMMITTEES
SCHOOL BOARD
PARENTS
SUPERINTENDENTS
PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
STUDENT BODY
TEACHER UNIONS
PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MY CO-WORKERS
ME

GOALS OF THE EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION

TEACHING
TEACHER & STAFF WELFARE
ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
COMMUNITY SERVICE
ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY
STUDENT WELFARE
ORGANIZATIONAL GROWTH
QUALITY STUDENTS
EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
PROGRAM ARTICULATION
ORGANIZATIONAL STABILITY
ACADEMIC SKILLS
OPTIMIZATION OF STUDENT POTENTIAL

IDEAS ABOUT GENERAL TOPICS

CHANGE
PROPERTY
CONSISTENCY
CAUTION
LIBERALISM
COMPROMISE
AUTHORITY
CONSERVATISM
RATIONAL
CONFLICT
EQUALITY
ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPETITION
EFFICIENCY
ETHICAL BEHAVIOR
VALUE SYSTEM
RISK

PERSONAL VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a list of concepts relating to personal value systems found suitable for inclusion in a study of in-school administrators and teachers. Of the original 82 concepts, 22 have been eliminated. Six concepts were suggested and these have been included, bring the total to 66.

The purpose of this check list is to indicate for a final time whether the remaining concepts should be included or not included.

Where there are obviously overlapping or synonymous items please include the item which in your opinion is most appropriate. Since brevity is the aim of all questionnaires, exclusion of overlapping and synonymous items is important.

Finally, please delete any item which you personally find to be vague or misleading. If items are unclear to you they will probably be unclear to others.

Please accept my sincere thanks for agreeing to spend the time and effort in aiding me with this most important phase of my study.

IDEAS ASSOCIATED WITH PEOPLE

DECISIVENESS
INITIATIVE
OBJECTIVITY
SELF-DISCIPLINE
FAIRNESS
COOPERATION
FLEXIBILITY
EMOTIONAL STABILITY
COMPETENCY
INTEGRITY
AMBITION
INTELLIGENCE
TRUST
LOYALTY
COMPASSION
TOLERANCE
CREATIVITY

PERSONAL GOALS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

SCHOLARSHIP
DIGNITY
ACHIEVEMENT
AUTONOMY
INDIVIDUALITY
JOB SATISFACTION
SUCCESS
SELF-ACTUALIZATION
PROFESSIONAL PROMINENCE
INTELLECTUAL GROWTH
EDUCATION
SECURITY

GROUPS OF PEOPLE

PRINCIPALS
COMMITTEES
SCHOOL BOARD
PARENTS
SUPERINTENDENTS
PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
STUDENT BODY
TEACHER UNION
PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MY CO-WORKERS
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
CONSULTANTS
ME

GOALS OF EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

INSTRUCTION
TEACHER AND STAFF WELFARE
ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
STUDENT WELFARE
EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
PROGRAM ARTICULATION
ORGANIZATIONAL STABILITY
ACADEMIC SKILLS
OPTIMIZATION OF STUDENT POTENTIAL
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

IDEAS ABOUT GENERAL TOPICS

CHANGE
CONSISTENCY
LIBERALISM
COMPROMISE
AUTHORITY
CONSERVATISM
EQUALITY
ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPETITION
EFFICIENCY
ETHICAL BEHAVIOR
VALUE SYSTEM
RISK
RATIONALITY

CONCEPTS RE-INTRODUCED

AGGRESSIVENESS
CONFORMITY
ABILITY
POWER
INCOME
PRESTIGE
INFLUENCE
CONFLICT

APPENDIX C

THE INSTRUMENT

Personal Values Questionnaire

This questionnaire is a "modified" verson of the Personal Values Questionnaire prepared by Dr. G. W. England, University of Oklahoma. Concepts included have been taken from studies on personal values by Dr. C. Padfield of the University of Alberta and Dr. D. Sjogren of Colorado State University. Changes have been done with the permission of Dr. England, Dr. Padfield and Dr. Sjogren.

PERSONAL VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is part of a research study of personal values. The aim of the study is to find out how individuals look at a wide range of topics. These topics are about people, groups of people, personal goals, organizational goals and general ideas.

You will be asked to judge the degree to which each topic is: (1) important, (2) pleasant, (3) right, and (4) successful. In completing this questionnaire, please make your judgments on the basis of what these topics mean to you as an individual.

Under no circumstances will your individual responses be made available to anyone except the research worker. The data I am attempting to gather are for use only in my research project on personal values.

In advance I wish to thank you for your participation in this study. It is through cooperation in studies such as this that we all advance our understanding of human behavior.

INSTRUCTIONS

Rate how **important** a topic is to you by placing an "X" in the appropriate box: the left box signifies high importance; the middle box, average importance; and the right box, low importance.

Then specify which of the three descriptions (successful, pleasant, right) best indicates the **meaning** of the topic to you; indicate your choice by placing the number "1" on the line next to it. Then indicate which description least indicates the topic's **meaning** to you by writing the number "3" in the space provided. Finally, write the number "2" next to the remaining description. Complete all topics in this manner and check to see that the three descriptions for each topic have been ranked in the manner instructed.

Examples

As an example, take the topic PATRIOTISM. If you felt that it is of average importance, you would make a check mark in the middle box as indicated. If you felt that of the three descriptions (pleasant, right, and successful) "right" best indicates what the topic means to you, you would write the number "1" next to "right". If the description "successful" least indicates what the topic means to you, then you would write the number "3" next to "successful", as shown in the sample below. Then you would place the number "2" next to the remaining description, in this case "pleasant".

For some topics you may feel that none of the descriptions apply. For example, you may feel that for the topic DISHONESTY, neither "pleasant", "right" nor "successful" indicates the meaning to you. If you have this trouble, you may begin by deciding which description least indicates the topic's meaning to you. For example, for the topic DISHONESTY if you felt that "right" least indicates the topic's meaning to you, you would write the number "3" next to "right", and so on for the remaining descriptions as shown in the sample.

Patriotism
High Importance ☐ ☒ ☐ Low Importance
2 pleasant
1 right
3 successful

Dishonesty
High Importance ☐ ☒ ☐ Low Importance
2 pleasant
3 right
1 successful

IDEAS ASSOCIATED WITH PEOPLE

			1 4 CC
Ambition High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Ability** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Intelligence** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	5-16
Trust High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Aggressiveness** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Loyalty** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	17-28
Integrity High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Compassion** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Fairness** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	29-40
Cooperation High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Tolerance** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Conformity** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	41-52
Creativity High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Initiative** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Decisiveness** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	53-64
Objectivity High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Self-discipline** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Competency** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	65-76

2
1 --- 4

PERSONAL GOALS OF INDIVIDUALS

			CC
Scholarship High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Dignity** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Achievement** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	5-16
Autonomy High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Income** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Individuality** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	17-28
Job Satisfaction High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Influence** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Security** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	29-40
Power High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Education** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Success** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	41-52
Self-Actualization High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Prestige** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Intellectual Growth** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	53-64
Professional Prominence High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful			65-68

---3
1 4
CC

GROUPS OF PEOPLE

School Board High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Parents** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Superintendents** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	5-16
Committees High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Me** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Professional Organizations** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	17-28
My Co-workers High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Principals** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Student Body** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	29-40
Consultants High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Teacher Unions** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Department of Education** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	41-52

GOALS OF EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

---4
1   4

CC

Equal Educational Opportunity High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Program Articulation** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Instruction** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	5-16
Teacher and Staff Welfare High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Organizational Stability** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Academic Skills** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	17-28
Professional Growth High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Student Welfare** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	**Optimization of Student Potential** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful	29-40
Organizational Effectiveness High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. _____ right _____ pleasant _____ successful			41-44

IDEAS ABOUT GENERAL TOPICS

---5
1 4
CC

Authority High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Accountability** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Change** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	5-16
Competition High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Compromise** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Conflict** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	17-28
Consistency High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Efficiency** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Equality** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	29-40
Ethical Behavior High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Value System** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	**Rationality** High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful	41-52
Risk High Imp. ☐ ☐ ☐ Low Imp. ____ right ____ pleasant ____ successful			53-56

6
1---4

PERSONAL INFORMATION

CC

A. Present Position (check one)

——1. Principal
——2. Vice-Principal 5
——3. Teacher

B. If you are a principal/vice-principal, do you also classroom teach?

——1. yes
——2. no 6

C. If **yes** to question B, how much of your time is spent in actual classroom teaching each week?

——1. 1% - 20%
——2. 21% - 40%
——3. 41% - 60% 7
——4. 61% - 80%
——5. 81% -100%

D. Total number of years in your career as a principal/vice-principal. (check one including this year)

——1. I have never been a principal/vice-principal
——2. 0- 1 year
——3. 2- 3 years
——4. 4- 5 years 8
——5. 6-10 years
——6. 11-20 years
——7. 21-30 years
——8. Over 30 years

E. Total time in your career as a classroom teacher. If you are a principal/vice-principal and you do **both,** only include the number of years you were a teacher. (check one including this year)

——1. 0- 1 year
——2. 2- 3 years
——3. 4- 5 years
——4. 6-10 years
——5. 11-20 years
——6. 21-30 years
——7. Over 30 years 9

F. Sex

——1. Female
——2. Male 10

6
4

G. Marital Status

——1. Single (never married)
——2. Married
——3. Widowed
——4. Divorced 11
——5. Separated

H. Age

——1. 20-24 years
——2. 25-29 years
——3. 30-34 years
——4. 35-39 years
——5. 40-44 years 12
——6. 45-49 years
——7. 50-54 years
——8. 55-59 years
——9. Over 60 years

I. Check higest level of education completed

——1. 3 years university
——2. 4 years university (no degree)
——3. Bachelor's degree
——4. Bachelor's degree & B.Ed. 13
——5. Master's degree
——6. Doctoral degree
——7. Other (please state) ....

J. Choose ONE of the following statements which BEST tells how well you like your job and place a check mark in the space provided

——1. I hate it
——2. I dislike it
——3. I don't like it
——4. I am indifferent to it 14
——5. I like it
——6. I am enthusiastic about it
——7. I love it
——8. I would rather not respond to this question

---6
1 4
CC

K. Check ONE of the following statements which BEST tells how you feel about an in-school administrative position. (principals/vice-principals read parenthesis)

——1. I would (do) hate an administrative position
——2. I would (do) dislike an administrative position
——3. I would (did) not actively seek an administrative position but would (did) not refuse one 15
——4. I would (do) like an administrative position
——5. I would (do) love an administrative position and would (did) actively seek one

L. Check the statement that best describes your school

——1. Regional High School
——2. High School
——3. Junior High School 16
——4. Consolidated School
——5. Elementary School

M. Check the description which best describes your teaching environment

——1. Urban 17
——2. Rural

Thank you.

APPENDIX D

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL

Department of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2G5

November 9, 1979

Dear

I am presently enrolled in the Master of Education programme at the University of Alberta, working towards a degree in Educational Administration, under the supervision of Dr. C. Bumbarger.

As I was an employee for seven years in Regional Administrative Unit #4 at Morell Regional Highschool and St. Peter's Consolidated School, and as an active member of various P.E.I.T.F. committees, my academic interest centres on Prince Edward Island and involves women in administrative positions.

The purpose of my proposed thesis is an investigation of the personal value systems of female in-school administrators, male in-school administrators and female teachers on P.E.I. My research is based on the work of Dr. G. W. England of the University of Minnesota and involves utilizing a modified version of Dr. England's instrument; the Personal Values Questionnaire (PVQ).

I have been in contact with both Mr. Jim Blanchard and Mr. Jim MacKay at the P.E.I.T.F. and they have assured me that the Federation will provide the lists of both administrators and teachers to aide me in the sampling procedure. Thus, the major purpose of this letter is simply to seek your permission in order to sample some of the teachers and administrators in your Regional Unit. This would involve at most, twenty minutes of their time to complete the questionnaire, which would be distributed, and return arranged, at no cost to them. No respondent would be personally identified in the study and the utmost caution taken to maintain the anonymity of each subject. Each member of the sample would be contacted individually about participating.

Should you view this proposal favourably, I would be very pleased to keep you informed as to the progress of my study and would be most willing to provide your Unit with a copy of the results upon completion.

As I propose to run my survey in mid-January, I look forward to hearing from you in the not too distant future.

I am,
Yours truly,

(Ms) Ruth C. Lambert

c.c. Mr. Jim Blanchard
Mr. Jim MacKay

Regional Administrative Unit No. 1
P.O. Box 57, Elmsdale, P.E.I.
Canada, C0B 1K0

November 19, 1979

Ms. Ruth C. Lambert
The University of Alberta
Department of Educational Administration
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G5

Dear Ms. Lambert:

You are hereby authorized to involve a sample of teachers from Regional School Unit One in your efforts to obtain questionnaire data.

Good luck

Yours sincerely,

Thomas Hall
Superintendent of Education

TH/jps

Regional Administrative Unit 2
P.O. Box 2500, 272 MacEwen Road
Summerside, P.E.I. C1N 4L9

November 16, 1979

Ms. Ruth C. Lambert
Department of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G5

Dear Ms. Lambert:

This will aknowledge receipt of your letter of November 9, 1979 in which you provided some information on your proposed thesis and the fact that you would like to collect your information from within School Units on Prince Edward Island.

I have no objection to your sampling some of the teachers and administrators in School Unit II and have taken the liberty of forwarding a copy of your letter to each School Principal within the Unit so that they will be aware of my decision.

If I can be of any further help, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

Leonard B. Russell
Superintendent of Education

cm

Regional Administrative School Unit 3
P.O. Box 1840, Charlottetown
Prince Edward Island C1A 7N6

November 20, 1979

Ms. Ruth C. Lambert
Department of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G5

Dear Ms. Lambert:

Further to your letter of November 9, 1979 to Dr. Parnell Garland, approval is granted for you to circulate your research questionnaire to a sample of Unit 3 teachers and administrators. It is understood that persons will respond to the questionnaire on a voluntary basis and that personal identification of any respondent would not occur.

Best wishes for successful completion of you study.

Sincerely yours,

Gerald Hopkirk, Ph.D.
Assistant Superintendent
Administration

sm

cc School Principals - Unit 3
    Jim Blanchard, P.E.I.T.F.

Regional Administrative Unit No. 4
P.O. Box 700
Montague, P.E.I. C0A 1R0

December 4, 1979

Ms. Ruth Lambert,
Department of Educational Administration,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G5

Dear Ruth

Please accept my apologies for not replying to your letter of November 9th earlier.

I have contacted our principals in Unit #4 and have made them aware of the possibility of your forwarding some of them a questionnaire; I have encouraged them to co-operate with you in your survey.

I would like to wish you every success in you Master of Ed programme at the University.

Sincerely,

Ralph Stonefield,
Superintendent of Education.

RS/cs

Unite Scolaire Regionale No. 5
Abram's Village
Ile de Prince-Edouard C0B 2E0

November 16, 1979

Ms. Ruth C. Lambert
Dept. of Educational Administration
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2C5

Dear Ms. Lambert:

Permission is hereby granted from Regional Administrative Unit No. 5 (Abram's Village, P.E.I.) for you to sample teachers and administrators to satisfy your proposed thesis of in-school personnel.

Hoping we may receive a copy of your study when completed, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

J. Albert Gallant
Superintendent

JAG/lb

APPENDIX E

LETTER INCLUDED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE

Department of Educational Administration
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G5

February 1, 1980

Dear Colleague,

After having taught for seven years on Prince Edward Island, I am presently enrolled in the Master of Education programme in the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.

In order to complete the requirements for the M.Ed. degree, I am researching the area of personal value systems in a comparative study of women teachers, women administrators and men administrators within an organizational framework for my thesis. To this end, I am requesting your assistance by taking no more than twenty minutes of your time, to fill in and return the enclosed questionnaire within three days of the date received. As you are well aware, a high rate of return is absolutely essential in any research project. Also, the approximate $1,000 cost for publication and distribution is being assumed personally. What lies before you now represents approximately $1.00 cost per questionnaire. At such cost, I would ask you to please avoid filling the round filing cabinet with this item.

Please be assured that all returns remain absolutely confidential. By placing the provided return label over your name and sealing the envelope, you will avoid being identified. The coding number on the back of the booklet is for follow-up on non-returns, while the numbers on the right hand column of the questionnaire are for computer key-punching only.

To further aid you in filling out the questionnaire please read the instructions carefully. It may be of some help to explain that the terms "Successful", "Right " and "Pleasant" represent the "Pragmatic", "Moralistic" and "Affective" modes of valuation.

Please allow me to thank you in advance for paricipating in the study. Having been a teacher myself, I realize your time is most valuable. However, in order for my research to be of some benefit, I again ask you to please return this questionnaire within the allotted time.

I am,
Yours truly,

(Ms.) Ruth C. Lambert

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW UP LETTER

#103 10625 81 Ave.,
Edmonton, Alberta.
T6E 1Y1
March 11, 1980.

Dear Colleague,

Firstly, please allow me to thank you for participating in my study on the personal value systems of men and women administrators and women teachers on P.E.I. Secondly, enclosed, please find your questionnaire. I am returning it to you as it is almost complete, and would ask you to please complete it and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provide.

As the missing information, either in the value concept or personal information section is an essential part of the study, I would request that you please forward it to me as soon as possible. The reason for doing this is that as it now stands, your questionnaire would be considered as a non-usable return and the amount of time you have already spent answering the questionnaire would be wasted. The number of questions already answered, indicates your willingness to participate and your understanding of what is being asked.

Should you not wish to complete the questionnaire, I would ask you to please state why on the back and return it to me anyway.

I again ask you to view the rating of the concepts in terms of successful as pragmatic, right as moralitic and pleasant as affective or "feeling" modes of valuation. Allow me to reassure you that your responses will be kept in strict confidence.

Upon completion, a copy of this study will be available to you at your Board Office. Again, thank-you for your effort and time spent in assisting me with this study.

I am,
Yours Sincerely,

(Ms)Ruth C. Lambert.

APPENDIX G

ANALYSIS OF CONCEPT RESPONSE

% of Respondents for Whom a Concept Represents
an Operative, Intended, Adopted or Weak Value
by Group.

(Group 1 = Female Administrators
Group 2 = Male Administrators
Group 3 = Female Teachers)*

Concept/Group	Operative	Intended	Adopted	Weak
1. Ambition				
Group 1	29	43	19	10
Group 2	44	30	7	19
Group 3	32	28	13	28
2. Ability				
Group 1	29	33	19	19
Group 2	32	26	7	36
Group 3	28	31	11	31
3. Intelligence				
Group 1	10	29	33	29
Group 2	17	15	21	47
Group 3	18	22	13	47
4. Trust				
Group 1	68	33		
Group 2	63	29	3	6
Group 3	74	23	2	1
5. Aggressiveness				
Group 1		5	14	81
Group 2	7	4	19	70
Group 3	3	4	21	72
6. Loyalty				
Group 1	62	33	5	
Group 2	65	22	7	7
Group 3	68	20	6	5
7. Integrity				
Group 1	52	43		5
Group 2	64	19	4	13
Group 3	65	19	7	10

* Totals rounded to nearest percentage and may not add to 100 percent.

Concept/Group	Operative	Intended	Adopted	Weak
8. Compassion				
Group 1	43	48		10
Group 2	44	18	15	22
Group 3	46	23	10	21
9. Fairness				
Group 1	62	33		5
Group 2	70	23	4	3
Group 3	73	21	2	4
10. Cooperation				
Group 1	48	43	10	
Group 2	41	30	8	21
Group 3	48	29	7	16
11. Tolerance				
Group 1	29	14	29	29
Group 2	33	12	21	34
Group 3	40	16	15	30
12. Conformity				
Group 1	5		24	71
Group 2	4	3	16	77
Group 3	3	7	21	72
13. Creativity				
Group 1	10	29		62
Group 2	14	11	22	53
Group 3	10	13	17	61
14. Initiative				
Group 1	29	43	10	19
Group 2	44	32	10	14
Group 3	30	28	12	31
15. Decisiveness				
Group 1	29	33	5	33
Group 2	33	29	11	27
Group 3	22	22	20	36
16. Objectivity				
Group 1	38	24	10	29
Group 2	38	18	21	24
Group 3	25	15	22	39

Concept/Group	Operative	Intended	Adopted	Weak
17. Self-discipline				
Group 1	76	19		5
Group 2	52	23	4	21
Group 3	57	24	8	11
18. Competency				
Group 1	68	24	10	
Group 2	49	36	6	10
Group 3	43	27	12	19
19. Scholarship				
Group 1	24	10	10	57
Group 2	14	10	30	47
Group 3	9	10	19	63
20. Dignity				
Group 1	57	19	5	19
Group 2	59	16	10	16
Group 3	49	17	15	19
21. Achievement				
Group 1	57	19	5	19
Group 2	59	16	10	16
Group 3	49	17	15	19
22. Autonomy				
Group 1	26		16	58
Group 2	11	17	18	54
Group 3	15	10	21	54
23. Income				
Group 1	5		14	81
Group 2	12	11	18	60
Group 3	10	13	21	57
24. Individuality				
Group 1	43	10	19	29
Group 2	32	15	14	39
Group 3	34	23	15	29
25. Job Satisfaction				
Group 1	52	43	5	
Group 2	41	50	6	4
Group 3	45	42	5	8

Concept/Group	Operative	Intended	Adopted	Weak
26. Influence				
Group 1	5		29	68
Group 2	6	19	18	58
Group 3	7	4	19	70
27. Security				
Group 1	24	23	10	43
Group 2	19	22	15	44
Group 3	32	30	14	25
28. Power				
Group 1	10		20	70
Group 2	7	3	8	82
Group 3	1	1	20	77
29. Education				
Group 1	38	14	24	24
Group 2	27	23	21	29
Group 3	32	23	17	28
30. Success				
Group 1	29	24	10	38
Group 2	33	43	10	15
Group 3	25	28	13	34
31. Self-Actualization				
Group 1	40	30	10	20
Group 2	35	28	11	26
Group 3	29	26	12	34
32. Prestige				
Group 1	10		14	76
Group 2	4	11	18	67
Group 3	7	6	16	72
33. Intellectual Growth				
Group 1	43	24	19	14
Group 2	35	21	15	29
Group 3	39	25	13	24
34. Professional Prominence				
Group 1	10		10	81
Group 2	6	6	15	74
Group 3	7	6	20	67

Concept/Group	Operative	Intended	Adopted	Weak
35. School Board				
Group 1	19	5	33	43
Group 2	21	8	38	33
Group 3	17	8	30	45
36. Parents				
Group 1	48	38		14
Group 2	62	30	4	4
Group 3	55	28	9	8
37. Superintendents				
Group 1	10	14	24	52
Group 2	27	11	32	30
Group 3	17	10	28	46
38. Committees				
Group 1	5	10	29	57
Group 2	6	6	34	55
Group 3	7	4	30	60
39. Me				
Group 1	10	29	38	24
Group 2	35	29	17	19
Group 3	40	26	13	21
40. Professional Organizations				
Group 1	10	14	43	33
Group 2	13	11	24	53
Group 3	12	7	31	49
41. My Co-Workers				
Group 1	38	48		14
Group 2	46	39	8	7
Group 3	35	37	7	22
42. Principals				
Group 1	43	24	14	19
Group 2	34	19	14	33
Group 3	38	22	13	27
43. Student Body				
Group 1	45	40	5	10
Group 2	58	29	6	8
Group 3	42	29	9	19

Concept/Group	Operative	Intended	Adopted	Weak
44. Consultants				
Group 1	14	5	29	52
Group 2	4	6	32	60
Group 3	9	4	28	59
45. Teacher Unions				
Group 1	10	14	33	43
Group 2	7	3	26	64
Group 3	18	6	31	46
46. Department of Education				
Group 1	5	20	30	45
Group 2	13	1	32	54
Group 3	21	10	31	37
47. Equal Educational Opportunity				
Group 1	65	10	5	20
Group 2	66	23	6	6
Group 3	62	17	10	11
48. Program Articulation				
Group 1	30	25	20	25
Group 2	36	15	21	29
Group 3	30	12	22	37
49. Instruction				
Group 1	45	35	10	10
Group 2	66	27	3	4
Group 3	64	22	6	8
50. Teacher and Staff Welfare				
Group 1	38	29	5	29
Group 2	43	11	18	29
Group 3	52	23	14	12
51. Organizational Stability				
Group 1	33	24	19	23
Group 2	37	19	14	30
Group 3	37	18	18	28
52. Academic Skills				
Group 1	40	30	10	20
Group 2	33	12	23	32
Group 3	45	18	15	23

Concept/Group	Operative	Intended	Adopted	Weak
53. Professional Growth				
Group 1	60	20	10	10
Group 2	45	19	15	21
Group 3	45	18	16	21
54. Student Welfare				
Group 1	57	33		10
Group 2	70	21	6	4
Group 3	67	20	4	8
55. Optimization of Student Potential				
Group 1	48	29	5	19
Group 2	56	18	11	15
Group 3	56	18	11	15
56. Organizational Effectiveness				
Group 1	48	24	10	19
Group 2	38	19	18	25
Group 3	34	17	21	28
57. Authority				
Group 1	14	5	43	38
Group 2	27	7	29	37
Group 3	19	10	31	40
58. Accountability				
Group 1	38	43	10	10
Group 2	63	18	10	10
Group 3	46	14	19	22
59. Change				
Group 1	5	14	33	48
Group 2	16	12	21	5
Group 3	16	8	26	50
60. Competition				
Group 1			38	62
Group 2	5	7	30	58
Group 3	6	3	26	66
61. Compromise				
Group 1		10	48	43
Group 2	23	11	19	47
Group 3	19	11	31	40

Concept/Group	Operative	Intended	Adopted	Weak
62.Conflict				
Group 1			35	65
Group 2	9	1	18	70
Group 3	2	4	33	61
63. Consistency				
Group 1	57	14	5	24
Group 2	55	18	15	12
Group 3	56	20	15	15
64. Efficiency				
Group 1	62	10	19	10
Group 2	45	30	10	15
Group 3	53	29	8	11
65. Equality				
Group 1	38	14	33	14
Group 2	62	11	10	18
Group 3	54	16	14	16
66.Ethical Behavior				
Group 1	48	29	14	10
Group 2	60	21	10	10
Group 3	58	15	12	16
67. Value System				
Group 1	57	19	5	19
Group 2	56	15	16	12
Group 3	46	16	15	23
68. Rationality				
Group 1	33	5	33	29
Group 2	49	18	14	19
Group 3	35	14	21	31
69. Risk				
Group 1	5		24	71
Group 2	9	3	30	59
Group 3	6	4	30	60

APPENDIX H

AVERAGE DEVIATION SCORES

Scores may range from 0 (homogeneous) to 1.65 (heterogeneous). The lower the AD Score the more homogeneous the group response to the concept.

FA = Female Administrators
MA = Male Administrators
FT = Female Teachers

Concept	FA	MA	FT
Ambition	0.68	1.01	1.38
Ability	0.86	1.55	1.59
Intelligence	0.78	1.02	1.11
Trust	0.33	0.53	0.30
Aggressiveness	0.24	0.48	0.41
Loyalty	0.43	0.57	0.47
Integrity	0.58	0.66	0.63
Compassion	0.63	1.14	1.06
Fairness	0.48	0.40	0.37
Co-operation	0.63	1.09	0.91
Tolerance	1.49	1.44	1.36
Conformity	0.39	0.37	0.44
Creativity	0.88	0.96	0.73
Initiative	0.77	0.94	1.58
Decisiveness	1.58	1.02	1.30
Objectivity	1.31	1.32	1.27
Self-Discipline	0.34	0.98	0.81
Competency	0.44	0.78	1.08
Scholarship	1.02	0.92	0.66
Dignity	0.86	0.84	1.04
Achievement	0.91	0.84	1.04

Concept	FA	MA	FT
Autonomy	0.94	0.85	0.86
Income	0.29	0.76	0.77
Individuality	1.35	1.40	1.40
Job Satisfaction	0.53	0.55	0.76
Influence	0.44	0.74	0.39
Security	1.38	1.16	1.33
Power	0.50	0.38	0.25
Education	1.44	1.18	1.41
Success	1.45	0.73	1.44
Self-Actualization	1.10	1.28	1.51
Prestige	0.44	0.52	0.49
Intellectual Growth	1.14	1.38	1.23
Professional Prominence	0.40	0.55	0.53
School Board	1.00	0.83	0.97
Parents	0.80	0.50	0.70
Superintendents	0.82	0.94	0.99
Committees	0.64	0.64	0.59
Me	0.73	1.20	1.15
Prof. Organizations	0.67	0.85	0.81
My Co-Workers	0.66	0.76	0.86
Principals	1.09	1.46	1.29
Student Body	0.80	0.65	1.04
Consultants	0.81	0.52	0.63

Concept	FA	MA	FT
Teacher Unions	0.91	0.56	1.03
Dept. of Education	0.85	0.73	1.14
Equal Ed. Opportunity	0.80	0.83	0.70
Program Articulation	1.40	1.44	1.36
Instruction	0.85	0.45	0.64
Teacher and Staff Welfare	1.26	1.34	0.87
Organizational Stability	1.31	1.37	1.38
Academic Skills	1.10	1.54	1.17
Professional Growth	0.70	1.12	1.13
Student Welfare	0.63	0.55	0.52
Opt. of Student Potential	0.96	0.85	0.85
Org. Effectiveness	1.01	1.30	1.53
Authority	0.57	1.24	1.08
Accountability	0.68	0.68	1.18
Change	0.76	0.93	0.90
Competition	0.38	0.66	0.53
Compromise	0.53	1.10	1.10
Conflict	0.35	0.47	0.47
Consistency	0.96	0.84	0.83
Efficiency	0.78	0.95	0.78
Equality	1.22	0.85	0.92
Ethical Behavior	0.87	0.71	0.87
Value System	0.86	0.83	1.15

Concept	FA	MA	FT
Rationality	1.58	1.03	1.59
Risk	0.39	0.66	0.56

APPENDIX I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Analysis of Variance

Group 1 = Female Administrators
Group 2 = Male Administrators
Group 3 = Female Teachers

Concept/Group	Mean Score	S.D.	F - Value	F - Prob
1. Ambition				
Group 1	1.90	0.94	3.00	.05
Group 2	1.98	1.13		
Group 3	1.63	1.19		
2. Ability				
Group 1	1.71	1.10	0.20	NS
Group 2	1.53	1.27		
Group 3	1.54	1.19		
3. Intelligence				
Group 1	1.19	0.98	0.26	NS
Group 2	1.01	1.14		
Group 3	1.11	1.18		
4. Trust				
Group 1	2.67	0.48	3.60	.05
Group 2	2.49	0.80		
Group 3	2.70	0.56		
5. Aggressiveness				
Group 1	0.23	0.54	0.93	NS
Group 2	0.48	0.87		
Group 3	0.39	0.72		
6. Loyalty				
Group 1	2.57	0.59	0.34	NS
Group 2	2.44	0.89		
Group 3	2.52	0.83		
7. Integrity				
Group 1	2.43	0.75	0.06	NS
Group 2	2.35	1.04		
Group 3	2.38	0.98		
8. Compassion				
Group 1	2.24	0.89	0.90	NS
Group 2	1.85	1.22		
Group 3	1.94	1.18		

Concept/Group	Mean Score	S.D.	F - Value	F - Prob
9. Fairness				
Group 1	2.52	0.75	0.35	NS
Group 2	2.60	0.70		
Group 3	2.64	0.69		
10. Co-operation				
Group 1	2.38	0.67	1.66	NS
Group 2	1.92	1.15		
Group 3	2.09	1.08		
11. Tolerance				
Group 1	1.43	1.21	1.16	NS
Group 2	1.44	1.27		
Group 3	1.66	1.27		
12.Conformity				
Group 1	0.38	0.74	0.06	NS
Group 2	0.34	0.73		
Group 3	0.37	0.70		
13. Creativity				
Group 1	0.86	1.15	0.62	NS
Group 2	0.85	1.09		
Group 3	0.72	1.03		
14. Initiative				
Group 1	1.81	1.08	5.99	.005
Group 2	2.06	1.05		
Group 3	1.55	1.21		
15. Decisiveness				
Group 1	1.57	1.25	3.43	.05
Group 2	1.67	1.20		
Group 3	1.29	1.17		
16. Objectivity				
Group 1	1.71	1.27	5.04	.01
Group 2	1.69	1.21		
Group 3	1.25	1.21		
17. Self-Discipline				
Group 1	2.67	0.73	2.88	.05
Group 2	2.07	1.18		
Group 3	2.27	1.02		

Concept/Group	Mean Score	S.D.	F - Value	F - Prob
18. Competency				
Group 1	2.57	0.68	5.44	.005
Group 2	2.24	0.94		
Group 3	1.93	1.14		
19. Scholarship				
Group 1	1.00	1.30	3.31	NS
Group 2	0.90	1.05		
Group 3	0.63	0.97		
20. Dignity				
Group 1	2.14	1.19	1.12	NS
Group 2	2.18	1.13		
Group 3	1.97	1.18		
21. Achievement				
Group 1	1.57	1.17	0.65	NS
Group 2	1.53	1.14		
Group 3	1.38	1.23		
22. Autonomy				
Group 1	0.95	1.31	0.05	NS
Group 2	0.86	1.07		
Group 3	0.87	1.11		
23. Income				
Group 1	0.29	0.72	2.20	NS
Group 2	0.77	1.07		
Group 3	0.76	1.02		
24.Individuality				
Group 1	1.67	1.32	0.93	NS
Group 2	1.40	1.30		
Group 3	1.62	1.22		
25. Job Satisfaction				
Group 1	2.48	0.60	0.80	NS
Group 2	2.27	0.75		
Group 3	2.24	0.88		
26. Influence				
Group 1	0.43	0.75	2.49	.1
Group 2	0.72	0.96		
Group 3	0.48	0.87		

Concept/Group	Mean Score	S.D.	F - Value	F - Prob
27. Security				
Group 1	1.29	1.27	6.65	.005
Group 2	1.16	1.19		
Group 3	1.68	1.16		
28. Power				
Group 1	0.50	0.95	1.78	NS
Group 2	0.35	0.84		
Group 3	0.26	0.54		
29. Education				
Group 1	1.67	1.24	0.26	NS
Group 2	1.49	1.18		
Group 3	1.59	1.20		
30. Success				
Group 1	1.43	1.29	5.21	.005
Group 2	1.93	1.02		
Group 3	1.44	1.20		
31. Self-Actualization				
Group 1	1.90	1.17	1.77	NS
Group 2	1.71	1.20		
Group 3	1.50	1.22		
32. Prestige				
Group 1	0.43	0.93	0.13	NS
Group 2	0.52	0.85		
Group 3	0.47	0.88		
33. Intellectual Growth				
Group 1	1.95	1.12	0.83	NS
Group 2	1.61	1.24		
Group 3	1.77	1.19		
34. Professional Prominence				
Group 1	0.38	0.92	0.53	NS
Group 2	0.43	0.84		
Group 3	0.52	0.88		
35. School Board				
Group 1	1.00	1.14	1.01	NS
Group 2	1.16	1.11		
Group 3	0.96	1.10		

Concept/Group	Mean Score	S.D.	F - Value	F - Prob
36. Parents				
Group 1	2.19	1.03	1.28	NS
Group 2	2.49	0.76		
Group 3	2.31	0.93		
37. Superintendents				
Group 1	0.80	1.03	4.14	.01
Group 2	1.35	1.18		
Group 3	0.96	1.11		
38. Committees				
Group 1	0.62	0.86	0.10	NS
Group 2	0.62	0.83		
Group 3	0.57	0.84		
39. Me				
Group 1	1.24	0.94	2.74	.1
Group 2	1.79	1.13		
Group 3	1.84	1.18		
40. Professional Organizations				
Group 1	1.00	0.95	0.29	NS
Group 2	0.83	1.06		
Group 3	0.83	1.01		
41. My Co-Workers				
Group 1	2.10	1.00	4.19	.01
Group 2	2.24	0.88		
Group 3	1.85	1.12		
42. Principals				
Group 1	1.90	1.18	0.86	NS
Group 2	1.55	1.27		
Group 3	1.71	1.23		
43. Student Body				
Group 1	2.20	0.95	4.51	.01
Group 2	2.35	0.92		
Group 3	1.95	1.13		
44. Consultants				
Group 1	0.81	1.08	0.71	NS
Group 2	0.55	0.78		
Group 3	0.64	0.93		

Concept/Group	Mean Score	S.D.	F - Value	F - Prob
45. Teacher Unions				
Group 1	0.90	1.00	4.77	.01
Group 2	0.53	0.86		
Group 3	0.95	1.11		
46. Department of Education				
Group 1	0.85	0.93	4.96	.01
Group 2	0.72	1.00		
Group 3	1.16	1.14		
47. Equal Educational Opportunity				
Group 1	2.20	1.23	1.22	NS
Group 2	2.49	0.84		
Group 3	2.31	1.03		
48. Program Articulation				
Group 1	1.60	1.19	1.27	NS
Group 2	1.58	1.25		
Group 3	1.35	1.25		
49. Instruction				
Group 1	2.15	0.99	1.62	NS
Group 2	2.55	0.75		
Group 3	2.43	0.91		
50. Teacher and Staff Welfare				
Group 1	1.76	1.26	6.57	.001
Group 2	1.67	1.29		
Group 3	2.15	1.05		
51. Organizational Stability				
Group 1	1.67	1.20	0.01	NS
Group 2	1.63	1.26		
Group 3	1.63	1.23		
52. Academic Skills				
Group 1	1.90	1.17	2.92	.05
Group 2	1.47	1.25		
Group 3	1.84	1.22		
53. Professional Growth				
Group 1	2.30	1.03	1.24	NS
Group 2	1.89	1.20		
Group 3	1.87	1.20		

Concept/Group	Mean Score	S.D.	F - Value	F - Prob
54. Student Welfare				
Group 1	2.38	0.92	0.49	NS
Group 2	2.56	0.78		
Group 3	2.46	0.92		
55. Optimization of Student Potential				
Group 1	2.05	1.16	0.07	NS
Group 2	2.15	1.13		
Group 3	2.13	1.14		
56. Organizational Effectiveness				
Group 1	2.00	1.18	1.53	NS
Group 2	1.71	1.22		
Group 3	1.57	1.22		
57. Authority				
Group 1	0.95	1.02	0.88	NS
Group 2	1.25	1.22		
Group 3	1.07	1.12		
58. Accountability				
Group 1	2.10	0.94	5.85	.005
Group 2	2.34	1.00		
Group 3	1.83	1.22		
59. Change				
Group 1	0.76	0.89	0.23	NS
Group 2	0.95	1.14		
Group 3	0.89	1.10		
60. Competition				
Group 1	0.38	0.50	0.88	NS
Group 2	0.60	0.84		
Group 3	0.49	0.80		
61. Compromise				
Group 1	0.67	0.66	1.41	NS
Group 2	1.11	1.23		
Group 3	1.08	1.12		
62. Conflict				
Group 1	0.35	0.49	0.29	NS
Group 2	0.48	0.89		
Group 3	0.47	0.68		

Concept/Group	Mean Score	S.D.	F - Value	F - Prob
63. Consistency				
Group 1	2.05	1.28	0.12	NS
Group 2	2.15	1.09		
Group 3	2.17	1.11		
64. Efficiency				
Group 1	2.24	1.09	0.92	NS
Group 2	2.05	1.08		
Group 3	2.23	1.00		
65. Equality				
Group 1	1.76	1.14	0.99	NS
Group 2	2.16	1.19		
Group 3	2.06	1.15		
66. Ethical Behavior				
Group 1	2.14	1.01	0.69	NS
Group 2	2.31	1.00		
Group 3	2.15	1.14		
67. Value System				
Group 1	2.14	1.20	2.13	NS
Group 2	2.15	1.10		
Group 3	1.86	1.23		
68. Rationality				
Group 1	1.43	1.25	4.13	.01
Group 2	1.97	1.19		
Group 3	1.53	1.25		
69. Risk				
Group 1	0.38	0.74	0.45	NS
Group 2	0.61	0.90		
Group 3	0.55	0.82		